

THE
AMERICAN
PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. III.—JULY, 1863.

ART. I.—THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

By Professor PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

THE Heidelberg Catechism,* whose three hundredth anniversary has been so widely celebrated this year in Europe and America, was first published A.D. 1563, under the title: *Catechism, or Christian Instruction, as given in the Churches and Schools of the Palatinate*. It belongs to the Reformed, as distinguished from the Lutheran confessions, though it shows traces of the influence of Melancthon. The reformation was introduced into the Palatinate under the Elector Frederick II, in 1546, in the spirit of a moderate Lutheranism. Under Otho Henry, 1556–1559, Heidelberg was the centre of violent doctrinal controversies between the Lutherans and the Calvinists. The Elector Frederick III, surnamed the Pious, who reigned from 1559 to 1576, openly espoused the reformed confession. He was one of the most wise, earnest, and devout princes of the reformation century. Under his influence was drawn up the Heidelberg Catechism.

* The official editions bear date 1563, 1585, 1684, 1724. An American Tercenary edition will soon be issued in three languages. The most important sources for its history are in the works of Alting, Struve, Wundt, and Planck; and in the special treatises of Van Alpen 1800, Leissen 1846, Vierordt 1847, Sudhoff 1862, Schotel 1863.

I. Ursinus and Olevianus.

The preparation of the Catechism was assigned by the prince to two young, and at that time as yet little known theologians, one of whom, Ursinus, was twenty-eight, the other, Olevianus, only twenty-six years of age. The selection seemed hazardous, but was fully justified by the result. The work combines the warmth of first love with the light of solid knowledge, the fresh inspiration of youth with the deep experience of riper age. The history of that period furnishes yet other spirits that had early come to maturity; as Melancthon, who in his sixteenth year wrote a Greek grammar, and in his twenty-fourth year produced the first evangelical Lutheran dogmatic (the *Loci Theologici*), and Calvin, who in his twenty-sixth year published his celebrated *Institutis*, which have scarcely since been excelled.

Ursinus and *Olevianus* are the authors, and the theological and ecclesiastical defenders of the Heidelberg Catechism, as Frederick III was its originator, confessor, and civil representative. Both belong to the reformers of the second generation. They were no pioneers, no creative geniuses, able to lay foundations, like Luther and Calvin; but they had power to build up and carry through what was begun. Their mission was not so much to plant as to water, and the Lord has richly blessed their faithful labors. They had this advantage, that the fundamental doctrines of the evangelical reformation had already been brought up from the mines of God's word into the clear light of day, and were able to gather in the rich harvest which had been sown during the previous forty years. Both are fathers and confessors of the German Reformed church, who, on account of their faith, suffered deposition and banishment, and at last attained a blessed death in their faith. Both were Germans by birth and education, but had at the same time, by travelling and personal observation, made themselves well acquainted with the Reformed church of France and Switzerland, and those of their leaders who were still living, and were on this account also well qualified to set forth in a formulary the doctrinal views of the German Reformed church. Besides, Ursinus was educated prevalingly under the personal lead of the German Melancthon, Olevianus under the influence of the French Calvin. They breathed into their mutual work the inwardness and geniality of the Wittenberger, and the earnestness and fire of the Genevan reformer, and avoided as well the pliability of the first as the rugged severity of the last. Ursinus was more of a theologian and

professor, Olevianus more of a preacher and practical churchman; but both were one heart and one soul, and reciprocally complemented each other. Both exceeded themselves in the Catechism, which casts all their other works deeply into the shade. In the preparation of it they were inspired by the spirit of the German Reformed church, and they laid into it not so much their individual views as the faith of the entire communion which they served as organs. There is no contradiction here. The Catechism is a true expression of the convictions of its authors; but it communicates only so much of these as is in harmony with the public faith of the church, and observes a certain reticence or reservation and moderation on such doctrines (as the *two-fold* predestination), which belong rather to scientific theology and private conviction than to a public church-confession and the instruction of youth. Hence, also, the Catechism has not borrowed its name from its authors, and thousands of reformed Christians have learned it to their comfort in life and in death without knowing their names or any thing of the circumstances of their lives.

ZACHARIUS URSINUS,* the principal author and chief defender of the Heidelberg Catechism by word and pen, was born of poor but worthy parents in Breslau, the principal city of the Prussian province Silesia, July eighteenth, 1534. His father, Andrew Bear, was at that time deacon in the Magdalen church, and later became professor of theology in the Elizabethan School in that place. Ursinus early manifested superior gifts, and was prepared in his sixteenth year to enter the University. He studied, supported by stipends from his native town, nearly seven years (from 1550 to 1557) in Wittenberg, this birthplace of the German reformation, under Melancthon, and became one of the most confidential pupils and friends of this reformer and "teacher of Germany". He accompanied him to the religious conference at Worms in 1557, and from there he made with him, together with Peucer, Hubert, Languet, and other friends, an excursion to Heidelberg, where he was later to find his sphere of activity, and supply the place of his honored teacher. For Melancthon, as has already been remarked, had received a second call to Heidelberg as professor of theology, and felt no small inclination to accept it. "Conflicting thoughts", he wrote on the fifth of April, 1557, to the Councillor of the Elector Otto Henry,†

* His name originally was Bear, which, according to the custom of his time, he translated into the corresponding Latin name Ursinus. So the name of Lupulus was originally *Wölflin*; Ecclampadius, Hausschein; Melancthon, Schwartzerd, etc.

† Compare Corpus Reform. vol. ix, p. 127, and Dr. Carl Schmidt's learned bio-

"enter my mind; I do not desire new, and withal strange labors; I know that in Heidelberg, where persons of all nations, French, Netherlands, and others reside, there must reign a great variety of opinions and schemes; it is, to be sure, my fatherland, and excellent and learned men are found there, whose fellowship would be agreeable to me; but I can hardly make up my mind to emigrate. On the other hand, at Heidelberg I would have greater liberty, and could more conveniently confute the Flavians" (that is, the intolerant and exclusive ultra-Lutherans). From this letter, as well as from other documents, we may clearly see to which side of the controversy, which a few years later furnished occasion for the preparation of the Heidelberg Catechism, he inclined. The struggle of conflicting feelings and inclinations were decided by his prince, who held him firmly in Wittenberg. Instead of this, however, he paid a visit to the University of his beloved fatherland, in company with the above-named friends and pupils, during the diet at Worms, to assist in organizing it on an evangelical basis.

Those were joyful and festal days which Melancthon and his friends passed in the romantic city of Heidelberg. When he arrived there, October twenty-second, 1557, all the professors and students went out to meet him in solemn procession. Professor Posthius greeted him with an address and a Latin poem. The Elector invited him to his table in the renowned castle. On the twenty-fourth a great feast was prepared in honor of him in the Sapienz building. The venerable, modest, and retired man was overwhelmed with demonstrations of honor. But this festal joy was darkened by the intelligence of the death of his wife, who had already died on the thirteenth of October, in Wittenberg. His friend Camerarius, who was to bring him the intelligence in person, arrived in Heidelberg on the twenty-seventh, but deferred communicating the intelligence till the following day, when he opened the matter to him during a walk in the garden of the castle. Melancthon listened to the sad message with deep and painful feelings, but in pious composure raised his eyes to heaven, whither his faithful companion had preceded him, and uttered only the few but significant and touching words: "Farewell! Soon shall I follow thee!"*

graphy of Philip Melancthon, Elberfeld, 1861, p. 618. This work of Professor Schmidt in Strasburg ought to be translated into English, since we have as yet nothing able on Melancthon in the English language. Melancthon belongs to all churches of the reformation, and is a bond of union between them.

* Compare Dr. C. Schmidt, a. a. b. p. 618, *et seq.*

Ursinus, now provided by Melancthon with a very honorable Latin testimonial, in which he is represented as a "highly gifted, learned, pious, agreeable youth, endeared to all honorable men", made a learned journey to Switzerland and France. There he became personally acquainted with the leaders of the Reformed church who were still living, especially with Bullinger and Peter Martyr in Zurich, with Calvin and Beza in Geneva. Calvin (who died 1564) presented him with his writings, and recorded in them with his own hand his prayer for a blessing upon the young friend. This journey enlarged his spiritual views, and decided his preference for the Reformed church. The vacillating position of Melancthon between Lutheranism and Calvinism could thenceforward no more satisfy him, even though he was allied to his venerable teacher in mildness and love of peace, and continued to regard him with great respect and love to the end of his life.

When he, in 1556, returned to Wittenberg, he was met by a call to the office of rector in the Elizabethan Gymnasium in Breslau, which, from love and gratitude to his native city, he accepted. Yet two years afterwards, he of his own accord resigned this position from love of peace, on account of the violent sacramental controversy between the Lutherans and Philippists of that place. During the strife he wrote his first work, "Theses on the Doctrine of the Sacraments", in regard to which Melancthon, shortly before his death, expressed the judgment: "Ursinus's learning I have known, it is true; but as regards knowledge in such things, I have never before been acquainted with any thing so brilliant."

After an honorable farewell, Ursinus left the second time for Zurich in October, 1560, which now, after the death of Melancthon (April, 1560), which had meanwhile occurred, had become more endeared to him than Wittenberg itself. At that time he wrote to his uncle: "Not reluctantly do I leave my fatherland if it will not endure the truth, which I cannot with a good conscience give up. Were my best teacher, Melancthon, still alive, I would go nowhere else than to him. As he is now dead, I will go to the Zurichers. There are pious, learned, great men with whom I am firmly resolved to spend my life. God will provide for the rest." That God, to whose guidance he intrusted himself with implicit confidence, had however appointed him to a field of labor different from Switzerland.

As early as 1561, Ursinus was called from Zurich to Heidelberg. Frederick III desired to draw Peter Martyr, whom he

held in high honor, from Zurich to his University; but on account of advanced age he declined the invitation, and recommended in place of himself young Ursinus, who was admirably suited for the post, and labored with good effect. In the following year (August twenty-eighth, 1562) he was promoted to the honor of Doctor. He delivered lectures on dogmatics in the University, and was at the same time principal of the so-called Sapienz College, a preacher-seminary, founded by Otto Henry, enlarged by Frederick III so as to take in seventy pupils, and which stood in intimate connection with the University. This college, with a small salary, gave him so much labor and weariness, that he sometimes, in spells of hypochondria, called it his "tread-mill", or "martyr-chamber". He had a desire in 1571 to accept an honorable call to the theological school at Lausanne; but the prince would not accept his resignation. He married only in 1574, in which state he lived happily, and had one son born to him. His pupils were devoted to him with much love and enthusiasm.

In this position he labored with unwearied industry, notwithstanding increasing infirmities, till the death of Frederick III, 1576, when by his Lutheran son and successor, Ludwig VI, he was, on account of his reformed faith, together with six hundred steadfast reformed ministers, deposed and directed to leave the country. Still he found a place of refuge in the small district of country belonging to the Palsgrave John Casimir, on the left bank of the Rhine. Under his auspices he, with other banished Heidelberg theologians, founded and conducted the high-school at Neustadt, on the Hardt, the so-called *Casimirianum*, which had so speedily sprung up since 1578, and continued his activity in theological teaching by word and pen to the time of his death. His last works were an explanation of the prophecy of Isaiah, and a defence of the reformed doctrine against the attacks of the Lutheran form of concord. In the full power of manhood, aged forty-eight years, he died in the triumphs of a joyful faith, March sixth, 1583—the same year in which Casimir, the younger son of Frederick III, came in possession of the government, called back the banished ministers, and restored the reformed confession in the Palatinate. His pupil and colleague, Franz Junius, delivered a Latin funeral discourse full of the warmest admiration and affection.

Ursinus was a man of thorough classical, theological, and philosophical learning, of poetic talent, distinguished teaching gifts, simple, modest, and attractive character, and deep evangelical piety. He made the best use of his time, having

placed above the door of his study the inscription: "Friend, when thou visitest me, be brief, or depart, or assist me in my labor".* He avoided all useless words. The excellent first question of the Catechism is characteristic of his piety, as also his declaration that he would not take a hundred thousand worlds for the blessed certainty of belonging to Jesus Christ. He exceeded the reformed theologians of his time; and in the Heidelberg Catechism he has far exceeded himself. His other works, collected by his pupil David Pareus, at first appeared anonymously, or in the name of the faculty of Heidelberg, or as gathered after his death from notes taken by others. The most important of these is his extensive Latin commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism (*Corpus Doctrinæ Orthodoxæ*), of which there are also a number of English translations,† and a popular German abstract.‡ In his epitaph in the church at Neustadt he is pronounced, "a great theologian, a vanquisher of false doctrines concerning the Person of Christ and the Lord's Supper, an acute philosopher, a wise man, and a strict teacher of youth".

CASPER OLEVIANUS,§ the son of a baker, was born August 10th, 1536, in Treves, the city of "the holy coat of Christ", on the borders of France, and studied the ancient languages and law in the Universities of Paris, Bourges, and Orléans. When he, at Bourges, by a heroic venture, endeavored to save from drowning in the river Loire, or according to others in the Eure, the son of the same Frederick III who afterwards called him into his service, and thereby greatly endangered his own life, he vowed to devote himself to the Lord with all that he was and possessed. He now studied theology in Geneva under Calvin and Beza, and in Zurich under Bullinger and Peter Martyr. He enjoyed thus, like his later colleague Ursinus, the great advantage of the personal instruction and communion of the most celebrated founders and leaders of the Reformed church.

In 1559 he began his reformatory activity as a fearless preacher of the pure Gospel in his native city, Treves. On one occasion a Roman priest endeavored to interfere with his

* "Amice, quisquis huc venis, aut agita paucis, aut obi, aut me laborantem adjuva."

† The latest English edition is by Rev. W. Williard, in Columbus, Ohio, 1859, on the basis of the translation of Dr. J. Parry, with an Introduction by Dr. Nevins.

‡ Dr. Zac. Ursinus's Introduction to Christian Instruction, etc. An Abstract of his *Corpus Doctrinæ Orthodoxæ*. With a Preface by Lie. E. W. Krummacher. Duisburg, 1863.

§ So called from Olewig, a village near Treves, from which his father sprang. So Göbel contends, without giving any authorities.

preaching, and in so doing excited his hearers to such a degree that they were willing to lay violent hands on him; then Olevianus, with his characteristic magnanimity, took him by the hand and led him out of the church, that he might receive no injury. The half of the inhabitants had already been won over to the evangelical doctrines when he was persecuted by the Bishop, and, together with the two burgomasters of the city and nine others who shared in the same views, was cast into prison. After ten weeks, however, through the mediation of the Protestant princes, especially of Frederick III, who felt himself gratefully indebted to him, he was delivered from prison, and called by the last, in 1560 (one year before Ursinus), to the University of Heidelberg as professor, first of philosophy, and afterwards of theology. Later he resigned his professorship into the hands of Ursinus, and labored as court preacher and church counsellor.

At the accession of Ludwig VI, in 1576, Olevianus, like Ursinus, as a steadfast confessor of the reformed doctrine, was also deposed and driven away. He followed a call to Basleberg, and in 1584 went as preacher to Herborn. In his last sickness he only rightly learned to know, as he said, the greatness of sin and the greatness of the majesty of God, and often prayed: "Could I only soon return home to my Lord; I long to depart and to be with Christ". He died in Herborn, February twenty-fifth, 1587, in peace, after he had replied to the question of a friend whether he was certain of his salvation, by laying his hand upon his heart and uttering the triumphant word of faith, "Certissimus!" that is, "perfectly certain". Theodore Beza, the patriarch of the Reformed church, who outlived the rest, mourns his death in a Latin poem full of deep grief and enthusiastic praise, erecting for him thus an honorable memorial.*

Olevianus was less learned than Ursinus, and his exegetical, dogmatical, and homiletical works are not very important for scientific theology; but they are popular, true-hearted, full of energy and unction. Perhaps the best is his catechetical work on the covenant of grace. He regarded the covenant of grace as the key to the true understanding of the Bible, and thus became the precursor of Coccejus and Lampe, who further developed the federal or covenant theology. His principal

* The beginning of the poem is as follows:

Eheu, quibus suspiriis,
Eheu, quibus te lachrymis,
Oleviane planxero?
Nam dotibus pases tuis,

Doloribus pares meis,
Questus modosque flebiles
Non pectus hoc siggesserit,
Non istud os effuderit.

strength, however, lay in his practical talent for the pulpit and church government, in which he exceeded Ursinus, and complemented him. In all ecclesiastical matters he was the confidential and influential counsellor of Frederick III, with whom he became associated through a singular providence.

He was unwearied in his labors to introduce into the Palatinate the Presbyterian and Synodical form of church government and a strict church discipline, after the pattern of the congregation of Geneva in its blooming period, which was also by the Scotch reformer Knox so much admired, and in accordance with the clearly expressed principles of the Heidelberg Catechism itself, Question 82-55, and for this purpose early secured the advice of Calvin. This matter, also, lay very near the heart of the prince, of Ursinus, and of all foreign Calvinists. But the practical carrying out of it succeeded only very imperfectly, and was much hindered, especially through the professor of medicine, Thomas Erastus, who was an advocate of the government of the church by the state, and an opponent of excommunication.* To this day the government and discipline, and the self-dependence of the church therewith connected, is far less developed in the German churches than it is in other Reformed churches, especially in Holland, Scotland, and North America. The intimate union of church and state in the Palatinate, and in Germany generally, was an almost insurmountable obstacle. For the victory of strict church discipline and national presbyterial and congregational government, with lay representation, is at the same time, at least in extensive countries (the old Calvinistic Geneva forms an exception on account of its small compass), a victory of the self-dependent free-churchdom and popular churchdom over state-churchdom. In relation to self-government, the German Reformed church in the United States has a great advantage over the mother church in Germany and Switzerland, where the church is still under guardianship of the state.

II. The Preparation and Ecclesiastical Approval of the Catechism.

Intrusted with the preparation of a new Catechism, Ursinus and Olevianus first jointly collected the material from the catechetical literature of the Reformed church, especially of Swit-

* Hence the technical English term Erastianism, which is very much the same as Cæsaropapismus, and the teaching indicates that the political ruler of the land is at the same time the ecclesiastical ruler, or the chief Bishop of his subjects. Eras-

zerland,* which was even at that time very rich. The mother country of the Reformed church has, therefore, at least indirectly, had share in the origination of the Heidelberg Catechism, even as both its authors also completed their education in Zurich and Geneva. They made most use of the Catechism of Geneva by Calvin, and the Catechism of De Lasky allied to it.† Then each one prepared a sketch or draft as preparatory work, Olevianus following the leading idea of the covenant of grace, Ursinus following the Calvinistic division of the material into five principal parts: of faith, law, prayer, word of God, and sacrament. Ursinus wrote two catechisms in the Latin language; a larger one (with the title, *Catechesis, hoc est, Rudimenta Religionis Christianæ*), and a smaller (*Catechesis Minor*), an abridgment of the first.

On the basis of these careful preparations, which had been laid before the Prince and received his approval, originated the present Heidelberg Catechism. It is however with all its affinity with its predecessors an independent creation. This is plainly seen in the division and design of the whole, as well as in the single questions, which show a great advance on the drafts.‡ The final preparation was the work of both

tus was a Swiss by birth, and a Zwinglian as respects the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He died in Basel as professor of ethics in 1583. He was a man of much spirit and learning, and one of the first among the learned who declared himself in opposition to the superstition of astrology and alchymy.

* So Olevianus wrote to Bullinger in Zurich.

† The affinity of the Heidelberg Catechism with those of Calvin and De Lasky, which, however, does not take away from the first any of its independent value, has been especially shown by Leisen and Sudhoff. Calvin's Catechism appeared first in 1536, then entirely reconstructed and divided into questions and answers, in 1541, in French, and in 1545 in Latin, and was afterwards also translated into Spanish, Italian, English, Greek, and Hebrew. In its improved form it is found in Calvin's works (Amsterdam edition, tom. viii, pp. 11-37), and in Niemeyer's and Böckel's collection of the Reformed Confessions. Lasky's Catechism appeared in 1553. John Lasky (de Lasco) was a Polish nobleman who connected himself with the Swiss reformation, and labored partly in England (under Edward VI), partly in the Netherlands and Germany, and at last in Poland, where he introduced the reformation. He died in 1560.

‡ Compare for instance the much admired first question in the Catechism with the first question in the preparatory work of Ursinus, and the great advance will at once be seen. In the Larger Catechism-draft of Ursinus (comp. Sudhoff, Theolog. Handboek, etc., p. 477) the first question and answer are as follows:

Quam habes firmam in vita et morte consolationem?

Quod a Deo ad imaginem ejus et vitam æternam suum conditus et postquam hanc volens in Adamo amiseram, Deus ex immensa et gratuita misericordia me recepit in fœdus gratiæ suæ, et propter obedientiam et mortem Filii sui missi in carnem donat mihi credenti justitiam et vitam æternam: atque hoc fœdus suum in corde meo per per Spiritum suum ad imaginem Dei me reformantem et clamantem in me *Abba Pater*, et per verbum suum et signa hujus fœderis visibilia obsignavit.

In the Smaller Catechism of Ursinus the first question and answer run more briefly and simplified thus:

Quæ tua est consolatio qua tam in morte quam in vita cor tuum se sustentat?

theologians under the constant coöperation of Frederick III. Ursinus has always properly been regarded as the principal author, as he was afterwards also its chief defender and interpreter. Still it would appear that the nervous German style, the division into three parts (as distinguished from the five parts in the Catechism of Calvin, and the smaller one of Ursinus) and the genial warmth and unction of the whole work, come chiefly from Olevianus.* In any case, however, as has already been remarked, the work is far better than all the private writings of both theologians. It was produced under the influence of a spirit which was higher, deeper, and more comprehensive than their own spirit.

Augusti expresses his astonishment that the Catechism should have been finished in a few months, and yet manifest in its construction "so few traces of haste, and so many perfections".† But its authors may probably have labored on it a whole year or more; and they entered upon their work, as we have seen, with much forecast and conscientiousness. Then, also, that was a period of religious inspiration and creative activity, and very fruitful in catechetical books of instruction. The Catechisms of Luther, Brentz, Leo Judä, Bullinger, Ecolampadius, Calvin, and De Lasky had preceded, and nearly the same time the Catechism of the Roman church was also prepared. Such preparatory works served the authors a good purpose. The principal doctrines of evangelical Protestantism had been already substantially wrought out, and needed only a calm, clear presentation and combination.

When the work was finished, the Prince, in December, 1562, convened a general Synod at Heidelberg, composed of the superintendents and most prominent ministers of the Palatinate, who were conscientiously to examine and prove the Catechism according to God's word. According to Van Alpen the adoption of it was unanimous. But according to the reports of the opposite party (Baldwin, Hesshus, Flacius Illyr-

Quod omnia peccata mea Deus mihi propter Christum remisit, vitamque æternam donavit in qua ipsum perpetuo celebrem.

Calvin's Catechism begins with the question: What is the chief end of human life? ("Quis humanæ vitæ præcipuus est finis?") from which originated the first question of the Westminster Catechism: "What is the *chief end* of man?" The first question of the Heidelberg Catechism on the *only* comfort of man in life and in death, is, among all these preparatory attempts, by far the best.

* So think Hundeshagen and Sudhoff. The last is especially zealous for the honor of Olevianus in opposition to the frequent overestimate placed on the services of Ursinus in the preparation of the Catechism.

† A Historical and Critical Introduction to the two Principal Catechisms of the Evangelical Church, 1824, p. 100.

icus and others) there was a small minority who brought in manifold objections to it, but were outvoted. The last is more likely, and does not derogate in the least from the value of the Catechism. No good work, no new idea, no true advance can succeed without the fiery ordeal of contradiction and persecution. This belongs throughout to the militant character of the Church in this world, and to the following of Christ and his Apostles. Besides, the Catechism was required to pass through the strongest opposition after its adoption and introduction, and was bitterly persecuted from various directions, but victoriously endured the trial.

By its adoption by the representatives of the church of the Palatinate, the Catechism acquired, before its publication, a churchly character, and was thus in a position to fulfil its mission as a guide of public religious instruction in Church and school.

III. Its Publication—The Preface of the Elector—The most important Editions of the Catechism—The Eightieth Question.

After its approval by the Synod, the Catechism was for the first time printed and published, by order of the Elector in 1563, with the title: "CATECHISMUS, OR CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTION, as it is conducted in the churches and schools of the Electoral Palatinate. Printed in the Electoral city, Heidelberg, by John Mayer, 1563, 8." The preface is dated January 19, 1563. From this, however, we cannot conclude that the Catechism appeared on that day; no doubt a few months passed before it was printed and bound, so that it was more likely published in the Spring of 1563.

The Preface is published in the name of the Elector Frederick III, and was most likely also written by him; it speaks in an appropriate and worthy manner of the occasion and object of the Catechism. In it the Elector wishes to all "superintendents, pastors, preachers, officers in churches and schools", grace and greeting, and makes known to them that he, by virtue of his high office, and to promote the temporal and eternal welfare of his subjects on the basis of the sincere fear of God, and knowledge of his saving word, has, "by the counsel and aid of our entire Theological Faculty here, and all superintendents and most prominent ministers, prepared summary of instruction, or Catechism of our Christian religion from the word of God, both in the German and Latin language, that hereafter not only the youth in the churches and schools may be religiously instructed in such Christian

doctrine in a uniform manner, but also that the ministers and school-masters may have a sure and abiding form and measure as to the way in which they should conduct the instruction of the young, and not daily introduce changes according to their own mind, or ever deviate into perverse doctrines". Finally he exhorts and enjoins upon them gratefully to receive this catechism, to use it diligently in churches and schools, to teach and live according to it, with the firm assurance that Almighty God will also bless such good instruction from his word, to the improvement of their lives, and the promotion of their temporal and eternal welfare.

This Preface, though written in a somewhat loose, antiquated German style, breathes an excellent Christian spirit, and falls in very appropriately with the object of the work.

This first edition is now of course very rare; however, the younger Dr. Niemeyer, of Halle, in his Collection of the Symbolical Books of the Reformed Church,* has given it word for word, in the old style of writing, together with the preface of the Elector, (including the eightieth question), and thus rendered it accessible to learned readers. It has a number of peculiarities. The questions and answers are not yet separated and numbered; the division into Lord's days is wholly wanting, and the proof-texts are few in number, and the chapters only are referred to,† as the division into verses was not yet in use. Yet these are all unimportant differences, pertaining only to the form and not to the contents.

More important on the other hand is the deviation in the famous eightieth question, at the close of which the Romish Mass is called "a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry".

According to the common view, which has been repeated ever since the time of Alting, the eightieth question was not contained in the first edition, but was first included in the second edition, except only the clause "and an accursed idolatry", and then introduced in full in the third edition by order of Frederick III, as a counter-blast to the anathema of the Council of Trent.‡ The same authors commonly distinguish

* *Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis publicatarum.* Edidit Dr. H. A. Niemeyer: Lipsiæ, 1840, pp. 390-427. Bökel, in his edition of the Reformed Symbols, gives the Catechism in modern German. Both give the Elector's preface in full, the first in the original, the other in the modern style.

† For instance in the first question are cited: "a) Rom. 14. b) 1 Cor. 6. c) 1 Cor. 3. d) 1 Pet. 1. e) John 1 and 2. f) 1 John 3. g) John 6. h) Math. 10. Luke 21. i) Rom. 8. k) 2 Cor. 1. Eph. 1. Rom. 8. l) Rom. 8."

‡ So Alting, Struve, Van Alpen, Augusti, Nienäcker, Niemeyer (Præf. lxii. sq.), Sudhoff (who repeats this error four times), etc. The whole mistake comes from

three different editions of the whole Catechism as having appeared in the year 1563, and explain the circumstance that the first two editions are so rare, by the supposition that the Elector had called in and suppressed them.

But this view seems to rest in an error. We hold that the eightieth question was contained in the first edition with the exception of the offensive last clause, which was added by order of the Elector in part in the second printing, and entire in the third. There were therefore not three different editions, but merely two later reprints of one page, namely, folio 55, on which the eightieth question is found; so that the last reprints of the year 1563 which contain the offensive addition, and at the same time a closing remark on the last page, are in other respects precisely alike. This closing remark is as follows: "What in the first printing (not edition) was overlooked, as especially folio 55, is now added by order of his Electoral Grace, 1563".

My reasons for this view, to which Dr. Ullman* and Dr. Nevin† also incline, are the following: 1. The eightieth question, with the exception only of this last clause, is altogether inoffensive, and also complete without it; containing a worthy and calm statement of the difference between the Romish Mass and the evangelical Lord's Supper. 2. D. L. Wundt affirms on his own observation, that in existing copies of the first edition the eightieth question is found with the exception of the offensive close: "*So that the mass at bottom is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry*".‡ 3. The still existing copies of the so-called third edition of 1563, as the reprint of Niemeyer, are not at all designated as of a third edition, and so far as I can see, differ in nothing except on folio 55, and the above quoted closing remarks referring to this page.§

Alting, who expresses himself ambiguously, and it has then without being carefully examined perpetuated itself in later works on the Catechism.

* In his contribution to the Ter-centenary Commemoration of the Heidelberg Catechism, which will appear in the memorial volume.

† In his Historical and Critical Introduction to the large Ter-centenary edition of the Catechism, which will also appear during this year. At least I have so understood Dr. Nevin in a conversation on the subject. Earlier he held the common view.

‡ Magazine for Palatinate Church History; vol. ii, p. 112, et seq.

§ Köcher even, who had before him an edition of 1563, find it remarkable, that no trace of a deviation is found anywhere else, and that no one makes mention before Alting of a third edition of 1563. So also Augusti, p. 115. The reprint of the edition of 1563 in Niemeyer in his Collect. Conf. Reform., which I have used as the basis of my edition, gives the eightieth question in full, and yet has exactly the same title as the other copies, without being called the second or third edition.

4. It is in itself in the highest degree improbable that a book at *that* time, when the mass of the people could not read, and consequently the reading of Bibles and catechisms was confined to a small circle, should in one year have passed through three editions. Hence also we meet with no trace of a new edition till 1571, thus eight years after the edition of 1563.

In any case it must be admitted that the *last clause* of the eightieth question, from "*So that the mass*" to "*idolatry*", is no original constituent part of the Heidelberg Catechism, and has so far no original synodical sanction. It is certainly a well-meant, but still arbitrary and unwise addition of the Elector, who in this instance suffered himself to be carried away by the intolerant spirit of the age. It was a sharp Protestant reply to the surprising anathemas of the Roman Catholic Council of Trent, which just about that time, namely, December 4th, 1563, closed its sessions; and its introduction is easily explained, and in a great measure excusable in the light of this provocation, as also by the polemical spirit of the times. But—whether true or untrue, whether righteous or unrighteous, as against the Catholics—it in either case is in disharmony with the otherwise moderate and peaceful tone of the Catechism, and has been the means of drawing upon it much unnecessary persecution from the side of the Jesuits, and even for a time placed it under the formal Electoral ban in the Palatinate. Meanwhile this polemical addition to the eightieth question has passed over into all subsequent editions of the Catechism, and must therefore also be retained in future, or at best merely be distinguished from the original text by brackets.

Cotemporaneously with the German edition of 1563, which is of course the original edition,* appeared also a Latin translation, which was prepared according to the Electoral direction, by John Lagus, a minister, and the teacher Lambert Pithopäus, who had been called from Deventer to Heidelberg as teacher in 1562.

In the same year there appeared also an order of church government and Agenda, which was however revised and improved in 1585, when the Reformed church of the Palatinate was restored under John Casimir. It is far less important than the Catechism, and has never attracted the same attention, or been so widely received.

* H. Altling (cited by Nienäcker) makes, in regard to this point, the important remark: "Authentica est sola editio Germanica, in qua omnia non rotundiora modo, sed etiam *εμφατικώτερα* sunt. Ei proxima est versio Latina a Josua Lago et Lamberto Pithopæo adornata publiceque approbata."

The German was again reprinted in 1571,* then anew in 1573; and in this third edition (according to others the fifth) the Scripture proof-texts are for the first time indicated by references to the verses.† The number of proof-texts is here also increased, and the division of the questions into fifty-two Lord's days, after the manner of Calvin's Catechism (which, however, counts fifty-eight Lord's days) is introduced, as the Catechism was to be explained to the people every Sunday, in the afternoon sermons. It were well if this venerable reformed custom of having catechetical discourses, or a catechetical exercise with the children, in connection with the afternoon or evening service, were again revived.

A larger German edition, with the proof-texts printed out in full, with a table of domestic duties, and a number of liturgical and apologetical supplements appeared in 1595 in Neustadt on the Hardt. It is regarded as the best of the older editions, and agrees in size with the Latin edition of 1585.

The so-called Small Catechism first appeared in 1585, contemporaneously with the revised Agenda. It is an abstract of the large one, and was not designed to supersede this, but only to simplify it and render it more popular; since, as Prince Casimir says in his preface, some questions in the large Catechism are rather long for the youth, and might also be too difficult for the common people. A beautiful edition of this small Catechism appeared in 1610; but it never attained the same authority as the large one. Other abstracts, which appeared in later times, have had only a local and passing significance.

The large Catechism has since then been republished unnumbered times, separately, and in connection with Reformed Church Agenda, liturgies, hymn books, and other books of devotion. S. Van Alpen, in whose work, however, are numerous errors, speaks even of half a million of *editions* which had appeared in Germany alone, previous to the year 1800.‡ This is however incredible, as at this rate there would have been over two thousand editions each year. Perhaps he may have meant that many *copies*, in which case, however, his estimate would have been too low, as there were doubtless many millions of copies published. It has been often remark-

* Niemeyer calls this edition *quarta* editio under the mistaken supposition that there were three editions of 1563. According to our view it was the second edition.

† Hence, according to the testimony of Van Alpen and Niemeyer, this edition of 1573, contains on the title page this addition: "Now newly printed with the addition of the verses".

‡ History, etc., p. 284.

ed, that with the exception of the Bible and the Pilgrim's Progress, no book has been so often republished as the Heidelberg Catechism. But doubtless the *Imitation of Christ*, by Thomas à Kempis, and the small Catechism of Luther, do not fall behind it in this respect.

It is remarkable that with all this there has been as yet no critical edition, unless it be that of Niemeyer, which is, however, a mere reprint of the edition of 1563.* Hence much confusion has crept into the text, and especially into the proof-texts. This want, it is hoped, will now be met by the edition for the publication of which provision has been made by the German Reformed church of America in connection with the Ter-Centenary Commemoration, and other projected editions in Germany.

IV. Reception and Circulation.

The Heidelberg Catechism was so true an outgrowth of the genius of the German Reformed church, and corresponded so well with the needs of this confession, that it not only found favor in the Palatinate, for which country it was originally designed, and where it was introduced by the civil authority, but also found admission, and came more or less into use in various other reformed lands in and out of Germany, especially in East Friesland, Zurich, Cleve, Berg, in Mark, in Wapenthal, in Brandenburg, in Eastern and Western Prussia, in the Electorate of Hesse, in Anhalt, and in the free imperial cities; also in a number of Swiss cantons, where the Catechisms of Bullinger or Calvin had not already been introduced; and finally in Poland and Hungary, in Holland and in Belgium. In the Netherlands it was early approved, recommended, and clothed with symbolical authority, by Synod of Wesel, 1568, then again by a national Synod at Dortrecht, in 1574, and finally by the great Synod of Dortrecht, 1618; and since at the Synod of Dortrecht, delegates were present from all the Reformed churches of the Continent, and also from England, the Heidelberg Catechism there received a kind of general authority for the entire Reformed confession.

* Dr. Augusti (Preface, p. viii) applies the words of St. Hieronymus spoken of the Bible, "Tot sunt exemplari, quot codices, et unusquisque pro arbitrio suo vel addidit, vel subtraxit, quod ei visum est", also to the editions of the Lutheran and Heidelberg Catechism, and adds: "The matter is of such importance that a critical edition of both Catechisms would be a very meritorious work". Some late editions, as that of Mess and Sudhoff, especially the last, lay claim, it is true, to critical care, but have many mistakes and arbitrary changes in the text, and selection of proof-texts. Sudhoff falls into an error in the very first question, in putting "Einziger Trost" for "einiger Trost."

It was, for the Reformed church of Holland, of far more practical significance than the more rigorous Calvinistic Dortrecht Articles, because it was taught in all the schools, and explained to the people every Sunday from the pulpits. Its use contributed no little to the world-historical significance of this remarkable country, redeemed from the sea, which not only in the history of trade, but also of civil and religious freedom, of theology, science, and art, occupies an honorable position in later history.

In France, England, and Scotland, the Heidelberg Catechism could not, it is true, supplant their own, and partly older catechisms, but it was very highly esteemed, and a number of times translated into French and English. Beside the English translation at present in use, there were many older ones; for instance, one by Henry Parry, Bishop of Worcester, which, together with the commentary of Ursinus, appeared in Oxford, 1601, and then in London, 1633, and which has lately been republished by Dr. Steiner.* In the Reformed church of Scotland the Heidelberg Catechism appears to have been for some time in use; for in a collection of authorized church-books, which appeared at Edinburgh, 1719-20, in two volumes;† the Heidelberg Catechism is included with the remark, "Translated into English and printed for the use of the church of Scotland", notwithstanding the Westminster Catechisms of 1648 had at that time already been a long while in use.

From Holland and Germany the Catechism came also to America, and still continues to be the symbolical book of the Dutch and German Reformed churches in the United States. As the Dutch, as early as 1609, and hence before the Puritans (1620), Presbyterians and Lutherans, settled in the new world on the banks of the Hudson, on the island of Manhattan, where since has arisen the world-renowned city of New York, the Heidelberg Catechism, next to that of the Episcopal church (since 1607), is the oldest Catechism used in the American Protestant church. It is worthy of notice, that the German Reformed church of America, which has only during the last twenty years awoke to a powerful self-consciousness and theological life, will doubtless commemorate the three hundredth

* In the *Mercersburg Review*, and also separately printed in Chambersburg, Pa., 1860. The English translations have been made from the Latin translation, and are therefore in many respects incorrect.

† With the title: *A Collection of Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directions, Books of Discipline, etc., of public authority in the Church of Scotland*; together with all the acts of Assembly which are standing rules concerning the doctrine, worship, government and discipline of the Church of Scotland. By W. Dulop, 2 vol. 8vo., Edinburgh, 1719-20.

anniversary of the existence of the Heidelberg Catechism with more earnestness, zeal, and effect than the mother church in Europe, where, during the age of so-called illumination, it has been in many countries dislodged by modern spiritless and lifeless rationalistic catechisms.

The Heidelberg Catechism has not only been translated into all modern European languages, but also into a number of Asiatic languages and dialects (*e. g.*, those of Arabia, Malay, Senegal), as also into Latin and Greek (into ancient Greek by Sylburg in Heidelberg, 1597, into modern Greek in Leyden, 1648), and into Hebrew. In a larger measure than any other catechism has it received the Pentecostal gift of speaking in tongues.

In like manner has it been unnumbered times explained in sermons and commentaries. Whole libraries have been written upon it, especially in Holland. The commentaries most valued are those of Zacharius Ursinus in Latin (also translated into English, French, and German), of John Cocceus, John d'Outrein, Simon Van Alpen, and Carl Sudhoff. The largest number of commentaries, sermons, and controversial writings, appeared in Holland, Heidelberg, Neustadt on the Hardt, Bremen, Herborn, Frankfort on the Main, Hanau, and Halle.

Among all catechisms there is none, even Luther's smaller catechism not excepted, which has been so widely circulated, so much used, so often translated, explained, attacked and defended, and which can show such a rich and romantic history, as the Heidelberg Catechism. The ground of all this is to be found in its inherent worth.

V. Theology of the Heidelberg Catechism.

The Heidelberg Catechism, in the very beginning, introduces us at once into the living centre of practical evangelical Christianity, teaching us the secret of all true comfort and peace, the true art of living and dying happily. Thus the first question contains the theme or fundamental thought of the whole book: Christ is mine in all that I need, and I am his in body and soul, in life and death, in time and eternity. No catechism presents such an introduction, so rich in thought, so evangelically practical, and full of comfort. By many authors has this first question been pronounced a true pearl in catechetical literature. "Never, perhaps", says Dr. Nevin, "have the substance and worth of the Christian salvation, as a whole, been more comprehensively, forcibly, and touchingly presented, in so small a compass".

The second question presents the division of the Catechism,

which consists of three parts: The *misery* of man, his *redemption*, and the *gratitude* due to God for such redemption. The first part is prevailingly negative, awakening the sense of sin by means of the sum of the law in its essence, as requiring supreme love towards God and man. The second part presents the objects of faith in the form of facts, on the basis of the Apostles' Creed, including also the doctrine of the Holy Sacraments, not as separate doctrines, but as integral parts of the system of faith. The third part is ethical, unfolding the new life of obedience, from the truly evangelical stand-point of gratitude and reciprocal love, following the decalogue, which Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil. The third part closes with the Lord's prayer, as the expression of gratitude in the form of devotion.

The theology of the Heidelberg Catechism is, first of all, throughout, *biblical*; that is, it is based, not on the fallible traditions of men, but on the infallible word of God. Nearly every question is fortified by Scripture passages, which, as a general thing, are selected with much tact and great wisdom, although in these, from the stand-point of later exegesis, improvements might of course in some cases be made. The Heidelberg Catechism was the first which bound itself in this way to the word of God. It exhibits in this particular an important advance in catechetical literature. The smaller Lutheran and the Calvinistic catechisms are, it is true, also biblical in their contents, but not in their form, since, in the original editions, there are scarcely any Scripture passages cited. Later editions, especially of the Lutheran Catechism, have for the most part supplied this want, which, however, always necessarily involves an analysis and enlargement. At present, it is required of every good catechism, that it be at the same time a book of Scripture texts. A bare citation of Scripture passages does, of course, not answer. Many new catechisms teem with Scripture texts, and are nevertheless lean, sterile, dry, cold and dead. Every thing here depends on the selection of the proper passages, and on harmony with the spirit of the Holy Scriptures. It must be said of the Heidelberg Catechism, that it breathes throughout the spirit of the Bible, and is a stream from this pure fountain. Whoever assails it in any essential point, assails divine revelation itself. Hence also Frederick, at the German Diet, 1566, said his catechism was supported by marginal texts in such a manner that it must stand incontrovertible.

The theology of the Catechism is, further, *evangelical reformed*, that is to say, it belongs to the reformed type of doc-

trine, in contradistinction from the Creek Catholic, the Roman Catholic, and the evangelical Lutheran types. The reformed type is, however, not the product of a single man, but the product of the combined work of Zwingli, Ecolampadius, Calvin, Bullinger, Beza, and other reformers of the first and second generation, and hence owes something to each of them, but is at the same time independent of all. The reformed confession is the church of the pure word, of free grace, and of the free congregation; it assumes various forms under the influence of different nationalities, and in different countries in which it found a home; but its fundamental doctrines are the same in all its symbols.

In the Heidelberg Catechism the genius of the *German* branch of the Reformed church is developed and expressed. This stands mediating between the Lutheran and strictly Reformed confession, extends its hands to both, and works in upon both. It is the mildest form of Calvinism, and betrays the influence of the conciliatory Melancthonian spirit. Strictly, it is neither Zwinglian nor Calvinistic, nor yet Melancthonian, not even Ursinian or Olivianian; it rises above these human names and conceptions of doctrine, even though it has learned something from them all; and, like the bee, it has drawn honey from various flowers. It possesses Calvin's power and depth without his severity, Melancthon's inwardness and warmth without his indecision, Zwingli's simplicity and clearness without his cool considerateness and fear of the mystical.

In connection with this must be mentioned, as a still further advantage, its theological and pedagogical *wisdom* and *moderation*. Although not originally designed, like Luther's smaller Catechism, merely for the instruction of children, but also intended to hold the place of a confessional book, it nevertheless eschews all narrow-hearted confessional severity and sharp corners. Its few polemical questions* are kept within the bounds of dignity and moderation, with the single exception of the later addition to the eightieth question, directed against the Roman Mass, for which, however, Frederick III, and not its authors, is responsible. Other symbolical books of the sixteenth century contain expressions still more severe against the Roman church. In general, the Heidelberg Catechism breathes a mild, conciliatory, and friendly, in one word, a truly Christian spirit. This fact is only the more to be appre-

* Question 30 against the adoration of saints, question 48 against the later Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity, question 80 against the Roman mass, questions 97 and 98 against the use of images.

ciated when we remember that it was composed at a time when the "rage of the theologians", from which Melancthon so ardently longed to be relieved, had changed the entire Protestant church of Germany, and also the city and university of Heidelberg, into a battle-field, where not only Romanists and Protestants, but also Lutherans and Calvinists, contended in the most bitter and uncharitable manner.*

As regards more especially the relation of the Catechism to the peculiar doctrines of *Calvinism*, it here manifests the same moderation and pedagogical wisdom. In this respect it is more nearly allied to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England than to any other reformed symbol.

In its doctrine of the *Lord's Supper*, it follows Calvin decidedly, finds, namely, as did also Melancthon, in his approved edition of the Augsburg Confession, and was still more inclined to do in his later years, a medium course between Zwingli and Luther, and seeks to unite the truth of both, whilst it sets forth the Lord's Supper as a memorial of the crucified Christ, and at the same time as a feast of living union with the exalted and invisibly present God-man, though only for the participation of believers. This doctrine is also at this day the reigning one among believing Christians of the Lutheran and Evangelical Union churches, and would be so still more largely, were it not that Luther's name and authority still attaches many pious and learned adherents to his theory that Christ's body and blood are truly present *in, with, and under* bread and wine, and are received with the *mouth* by *all* communicants, by the unbelieving and unworthy, as well as by the believing—although, of course, with opposite results.

* Even Brentz, the worthy reformer of Württemberg, and, after the death of Melancthon, the principal representative of the Lutheran church, said, in a work against Bullinger in 1564, "The devil seeks through Calvinism nothing less than to smuggle into the church heathenism, Talmudism, and Mohammedanism". Comp. Hartmann, Johannes Brentz, p. 252. This intolerant sect spirit also early took possession of catechetical literature in the Lutheran church, even though Luther's Smaller Catechism is entirely free from polemics. Thus, there were, for instance, hyper-Lutheran catechisms at the close of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries, containing the following questions and answers: "What do you hold in regard to the God of the Calvinists? Ans. God protect us against such a roaring ox!" Ques. "Do you truly believe that the accursed Calvinistic heretics, instead of the living God, teach and worship the veritable devil?" Ans. "Yes, this I believe from the bottom of my heart!" There was also a book written, in which it is shown—clearly and solidly that the Calvinistic heretics hold 666 principles (the apocalyptic number), in common with the Turks!" I quote from memory, but have in my home (in Mercersburg) the evidence of these, and similarly curious specimens from the history of religious bigotry, the spirit of which has not yet altogether died out, although it may have changed in form.

On the other hand, in relation to Calvin's doctrine of *predestination*, which always found in Germany and Switzerland only isolated advocates, and which never entered into the general consciousness of the church, the Catechism manifests a wise prudence and reserve, which is the more significant, since both its authors (as in general all the reformers, even Luther and Zwingli, and at first also Melancthon) were themselves convinced of the scripturalness of this doctrine, and inclined even toward the Supralapsarian system. They were here manifestly governed by a proper tact, and felt that this mystery belongs rather to the sphere of scientific theology, and of private views, than to the religious instruction of the young, and popular instruction generally, or to the public confession of the congregation. In questions 1, 31, 53 and 54, the Catechism, it is true, takes occasion to teach the positive side of predestination, namely, *the election of the children of God to holiness and salvation in Christ*, in an uncaptious, biblical, and practical manner, as a source of comfort and ground of thankfulness; but it utters not a word of a *double* predestination, and an eternal decree of *reprobation* or *damnation*, in reference to a part of the human race; rather it teaches expressly, in question 37, the universality of the divine grace in Christ, who "sustained in body and soul the wrath of God against the sins of all mankind", which has given much trouble to the Calvinistic particularists, who hold that Christ died only for the elect. The Catechism teaches that believers are saved alone through the grace of God, whilst unbelievers are lost by their own fault. It cuts the roots of all Pelagianism and self-righteousness, without falling into the other extreme of making God responsible for evil. It holds, like the holy Scripture itself, on the one hand the unconditional sovereignty of God, which has foreseen and predetermined all things from eternity, and which works in us to will and to do, and on the other hand the responsibility of man, who is no blind machine, but an intelligent and moral, and consequently a free being. In the present state of knowledge, it is not possible fully to harmonize these apparently contradictory propositions; they are like two limbs of a large tree, whose mutual trunk stands under water, and is hidden from our view. In God, however, they are reconciled, and we shall understand this unity and harmony when once that which is in part shall cease, and we shall see face to face. The Catechism is, therefore, neither Calvinistic nor anti-Calvinistic, but leaves the conscience free in regard to this deep and difficult mystery, whilst the articles of the Dortrecht Synod and the Westminster Confession, in

clear words, teach the double predestination of Calvinism, and thus place upon it the stamp of ecclesiastical authority.

This freedom of the Catechism from rigid systems and scholastic theories is a great advantage, and makes a progress in theological investigation possible without the least prejudice to faithfulness toward the ecclesiastical confession. Hence it is that the latest and most prominent German theologians of reformed origin, as Schleiermacher (the greatest theological genius since Calvin, but who stands in the transition from rationalism to the newly awakened faith), Ullman, Bähr, Hundeshagen, Schenkel, Hagenbach, Ebrard, Lange, Herzog, Krummacher, and others,* have, without any violence or inconsistency with the genius of the church of their fathers, united themselves with the positive union movement, and labor hand in hand with the moderate theologians of Lutheran origin, as Neander (who was moreover an Israelite, but baptized in the Lutheran church in Hamburg), Nitsch, Twesten, Julius Müller, Olshausen, Tholuck, Lücke, Rothe, Liebner, Dorner, etc., for the upbuilding of the later evangelical theology, who, on account of their catholic spirit and learned worth, have exerted such a mighty and steadily growing influence upon the Protestant churches of France, Holland, England, Scotland and America. The Melancthonian spirit of the Lutheran church and the German reformed spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism, as they were originally closely affiliated, have, in the nineteenth century commingled in the *evangelical union theory*, and what God has joined together let not man put asunder.

The theology of the Heidelberg Catechism is *practically edifying*. It speaks throughout the language of living experi-

* We must, therefore, resist as well Heppe as Sudhoff, when the first saddles upon the Catechism an anti-Calvinistic Melancthonianism, and the second, on the contrary, a rigid Calvinism. If it were *anti-Calvinistic*, the strictly Calvinistic Synod of Dortrecht would not have sanctioned it; were it rigidly *Calvinistic*, it would not have gained favor among the Melancthonians of Germany. Dr. Nevin (originally a Presbyterian, Old School) has presented the true view in regard to this point, in the following language: "The knotty points of Calvinism, as they have been called, are not brought forward as necessary objects of orthodox belief one way or the other. Only in such form could the Catechism have gained such universal credit and authority. . . . It has sometimes been made an objection to the Catechism, that it is not sufficiently definite and explicit on some of these hard points of Calvinism. But we should consider this to be rather one of its highest recommendations. For children particularly, such excursions into the territory of metaphysics, in the name of religious instruction, are ever to be deprecated and deplored. But we may go further and say that they are wholly out of character in any church confession or creed. No church has a right to incorporate them in any way into its basis of ecclesiastical communion. In any case an extensive, complicated creed must be regarded as a great evil." *History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism*, pp. 131 and 132.

ence. It is the confession of the believing, well-grounded, graciously assured Christian, to whom nothing is holier and more precious than his Saviour. This warm, confiding, cheerful confession, is laid into the mouth of the catechumen, that it may continuously present itself before him as ideal. Even if he does not at first understand it, it nevertheless sinks into his heart like Scripture texts or verses of hymns, to take root and bear fruit at a later period. Christianity is nowhere apprehended and presented merely as abstract doctrine, but, as in the New Testament itself, as fact, power, and life. The Catechism has proceeded from deep theological study, but at the same time also from fervent prayer and living experience. It has received the baptism of spirit and fire from above. It has the unction of the Holy Ghost. A fresh enthusiasm of faith breathes in it, from the first question to the last. It addresses itself not merely to the head and the memory, but also to the heart and conscience. It is, in the best sense of the word, subjective, and brings the contents of faith into personal contact with the catechumen. It is as edifying and consoling, as it is instructive for old and young. It has become at once the book of devotion and prayer for the congregation. This is well known to reformed pastors of earlier and later times.

In proof of this, I present a very striking example which has just come to my knowledge, connected with the church of the Holy Ghost in Heidelberg, where Olevianus, one of the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism, was once pastor. Dr. Plitt, formerly pastor of that congregation, now Professor of Theology in Bonn, relates of his pastoral experience that he there met "not a few aged men and women whose eyes glistened when, in times of sickness, their thoughts were directed to the first question of the Catechism. Most of them still knew it by heart, having committed it to memory in the years of their childhood. Many said that as children they had never properly understood this question, and that they found great labor in learning it by heart, but now they thanked God that they knew it, and prayed it to their comfort and edification. The later generation, which had no longer been brought up under the Heidelberg Catechism, had no such an anchor in similar circumstances. But the aged, who in their youth had become familiar with the treasures of the Heidelberg Catechism, had passed through many vicissitudes of time, without having their inward peaceful trust affected by them. They stood on ground which could not be moved."*

* From an article on the Significance of the Heidelberg Catechism in the Reformed Church, in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1863, No. I, pp. 24 and 25.

With the excellent contents of the Catechism corresponds finally its pithy, clear, sincere, and popular German *style*. In this particular it is, to say the least, only exceeded by the smaller Catechism of Luther, that great master of edifying popular language. Dr. Plitt calls the language of the Catechism "exceedingly beautiful", and remarks very appropriately: "The Catechism speaks the language of *faith*, even of living, personal faith. What it says comes from the heart, and therefore also reaches the heart. It speaks the language of *life*. This concrete and throughout intuitive language of life—where is it more perfectly spoken than in the Holy Scriptures? From it has the Catechism learned it; and hence every one finds in it what he needs—not only the child, but also the adult and the aged; not only the uneducated and the unlearned, but also the most fully educated and learned. The Catechism speaks the language of clear *precision*." We may add: It speaks the language of *devotion* and *prayer*, or of communion with God, in language which is much less subject to change than the language of every day life, used in the intercourse of men; and thus it speaks to us with true power and unction, as from ancient times. The verse here applies: "The mortal have many languages, the immortal only one".*

ART. II.—THE ARISTOTLIAN AND THE MODERN PLACE OF
MAN IN ZOOLOGY.

By Prof. C. M. DEWEY, Rochester, New York.

THE rank of man in zoölogy has a higher interest as science advances, and as its moral aspects are better understood. In a previous article,† the great division of animals, by Aristotle, into *Enaima* and *Anaima*, the blooded and bloodless, the *red-blooded* and *white-blooded*, of modern times, was noticed. This corresponds to the Vertebrata and Invertebrata of Lamarck, as stated by Professor Agassiz: Essay, p. 96. But, though Aristotle followed no definite system in his excellent descriptions of animals, he saw obvious structural differences and recorded them. Thus, the division, Mammalia of Linnaeus, he had named *Zoôtoka*,‡ *viviparous*, as it actually is,

* Πολλαί μὲν θνητοῖς γλῶτται, μία δ' ἀθανάτοισιν.

† AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, vol. iv, p. 680.

‡ Prof. Owen on Mammalia, Sill. Jour. vol. xxv, p. 15, 1858, and Owen's Vol. on Mammalia, pp. 103, 8vo, London, 1859.

and made from it three sections: 1. *Dipoda*, bipeds (man); 2. *Tetrapoda*, quadrupeds, an extensive division; and 3. *Apoda*, impeds or footless, the Cetacea or whale family. In this actually *structural* view, man stands alone, separated from all other *mammal* forms. So early in the history of philosophy was man seen to be distinct, though not removed by this arrangement from the animals.

The simplicity and wisdom of such a system is seen in the few and obvious characters employed, so that the man of common observation could understand it. It required three thousand years from the day of Aristotle to that progress in science which culminated in the zoölogy of Cuvier. Yet, in this, the characters or properties employed are so removed from common acquisitions that not one in a thousand of those who are taught the four great divisions of the system, has ever had ocular demonstration of the structure on which more than one is founded, and not even that in the nervous system of fishes and reptiles.

But Linnæus divided the same mammals into *unguiculata*, *ungulata* and *mutica*. The unguiculates have *nails* on their fingers and toes; the ungulates have *hoofs*, and the other is the *footless* of Aristotle. Of course man is an *unguiculate*, and takes a much lower rank than that assigned him by Aristotle. If the Stagyrte had formed a zoölogy, man would have been higher even in structural arrangement than in that of Linnæus and Cuvier, for Cuvier made the same divisions of mammals, only calling the *whale* family *mutilata* instead of *mutica*.

Aristotle, however, had other, higher, and more philosophical views of man, which place him in a rank far above and wholly distinct from that of the animal. These are to be found in his works on Ethics, Economics, and the Soul or Spirit (*psyche*), and some of which are accessible to the mere English reader. Only a brief abstract will be given.

After stating of the musician, the statuary, every artist, and all who have any work to perform, Aristotle says: "The good and excellence of each appears to consist in his peculiar work; so would it appear to be with man, if there is any peculiar work belonging to him". "What, then, must this peculiar work (of man) be? For *life*, man appears to share in common with plants; but his *peculiar* work is the object of our inquiry: we must, therefore, separate the *life of nutrition and growth*. Then, a kind of *sensitive life* would next follow; but this also he appears to enjoy in common with the horse, the ox, and every animal. There remains, therefore, a

certain practical life of a being who possesses *reason*" (*logon*).*

This distinguishing power, *reason*, is to be shown in an active efficient life of virtue, or, in his words, "according to the best and most perfect virtue", that is, "in a perfect (consistent) life", as he explains it. The animal in man is not the active power in this life resulting from the due action of reason.

It is obvious that Aristotle distinguishes organized bodies into *plants*, *animals*, and *man*, three kingdoms with distinct limits; and that he holds man to be separated from mere animals by his reason. It is clear also, that reason, in his works, involves the *moral sense*, or sense of right and wrong, in his definition.

This elevation of man above the highest brute, on account of a power different, in kind, from any the brute possesses, Aristotle maintained in another manner. He states, what modern science teaches, that some animals have only one of the five senses, touch or feeling; that others have more, and many have all the senses. Then he asserts that "sensation is the principle of no moral action", and gives as decisive proof, "the fact that beasts possess sensation, but do not participate in moral action".† There is great unanimity of opinion on both these points among men, except in the case of a few zoölogists and naturalists.

In his Treatise on the Soul (*psyche*), Aristotle maintains the same great principles, a summary of which his *Ethics* presents. The soul, the grand endowment of man, is composed, in his words, of three parts: 1. The *irrational*, which is "common, and belonging to plants", as well as to animals and man, and "which is the cause of nourishment and growth in all beings that are nourished", as he continues, "even in embryos, and the very same in perfect beings"; 2. The *appetitive*, or that which acts in the desires and appetites, which he also calls irrational, though it "in some sense partakes of reason, in that it is submissive and obedient to it" (reason), or "tends to opposition to it", and is the animal nature in man; and 3. The *reason* (*logos*), the peculiar power or endowment of man, and the high power of the soul (*psyche*). The reason, he says, is in part intellectual, and in part moral, and hence he speaks of "intellectual virtues", as "wisdom and prudence", and "moral", as "liberality and temperance".‡ He said also that "not one of the moral virtues springs up in us by

* Aristotle's *Ethics*, b. i, ch. 7.

† B. vi, ch. 2.

‡ *Ethics* b. i, ch. 13, and 2. b. ii, ch. 1.

nature", while Plato had maintained that the moral virtues "were divinely bestowed".

These teachings of Aristotle present us with the ancient and correct notions of an intelligent and discriminating mind on the great point in which man essentially differs from even the highest animals. Though he employed language which differs from the modern teachings, his meaning is precise enough, and easily understood. He certainly laid the foundation for the correct classification, which places man at the head of organic life by his high rational and moral powers, of which modern zoölogists have generally lost sight. Had this classification been adopted, and strictly followed, philosophers would have seen it to have been "instituted by the divine intelligence" as one of "the categories of his mode of thinking".

Contrasted with the system of Cuvier the vast superiority of Aristotle's basic principle is most obvious. *Organic* is a higher state of matter than inorganic, even the tissue of a plant than a particle of sand or even a crystal; for it has *vegetative* life. Add to the organism *animal* life also, and great as is the advance, the animal characteristics are immeasurably inferior to the high power of ratiocination by means of language and the still superior moral sense, the *psyche* of the Stagyrte and of the world, which exalts man to a participation of the Divine image.

It is evident that if Aristotle had fully described the characters of the higher animals, the mammals, his views would have accorded with those of recent times, as the following: The higher animals are *conscious* beings, having the powers of sensation and volition, and the same five senses as man, the organs of which are equally palpable, and their voluntary actions fully manifest; they think and feel, love and hate; they have appetites and passions, desires and aversions, and often give proofs of anger or of kindness, as well as of some social qualities; they remember definitely, strongly and long, and reason in some slight degree; they contrive for protection and defence, and the good of their young; they have varied and strong powers of instinct, as their great governing principle, evidently acting for important results without instruction or experience. All those powers, essential to their existence and the continuance of their species, the benevolent Creator has bestowed upon them, that the object of their being may be effected. These powers they share with man, for they constitute the animal nature in man. Just so far as these are seen in them, the operations of animal life are decisive. In them, instinct is far more powerful and extensive than in man,

and it effects operations and results which reason could not reach. They are evidently conscious of their sensations, as of cold or hunger; of their desires and purposes, as of providing for their young; and of their means of communicating their thoughts or desires, or fears or joys. Such is the mere animal mind.

All these powers and actings are proofs of the *existence of mind in man*, and must be also, in the higher animals, evidence of the possession of the *same sort of mind in them*, as it understands, feels its connection with the outer world, and acts in accordance with the laws of its being. Thus far there has been a tacit agreement among all truly thinking men.

But, man is possessed of another and superior power, unknown in the mere animal, and passing under various names. It is the sense of right and wrong, the moral sense or conscience, the feeling of moral obligation so authoritatively expressed in the term *ought*, or the sense of religious duty to which man is bound. The explicit agreement of Aristotle, on this point also, has come down to us in his language, already quoted, that "beasts possess sensation, but do not participate in moral action".

The true system must distinguish between plants, animals, and man, as constituting three different kingdoms; for they are prominent before our eyes *by what they do*, and we cannot change the fact by refusing to notice it. The *structural* arrangement of Cuvier depends on physical (material or organic) differences, passing from the lowest or *radiate*, through the *molluscate* and *articulate*, to the highest or *vertebrate*. Thought, mind, intelligence, reason, soul and moral sense, do not appear thus far in the classification, and man is located with the beasts, and has only powers of the same mental kind with them. This is the understanding of the zoölogy of Cuvier by Agassiz, while he admits the transcendent greatness of these animal powers in man. And in Cuvier's divisions of mammals, not one of them has any reference to psychological powers, but simply relate to structure, as Agassiz also maintains. Retrograde and derogatory to the science of our age is the zoölogy of mere material form. In which of these do we see the higher thoughts of the Creator? Which approximates at all to that which is the glory of the Infinite Mind?

One of the great evils of this anatomical zoölogy is the continual controversies on the value of structural differences in determining the place of man in the system. After an extended examination of the structure of the anthropoid monkeys, the orang-outan, the chimpanzee, and the gorilla by Professor

Owen, the distinguished anatomical authority in England, he came to a decisive and full separation of man from those anthropoids. Adopting the system of Cuvier, though he admits that only the human body is formed for a human soul, he felt obliged to depend on anatomy to support his views of the rank of man. In an article published in 1857, by him, on the brain as decisive in the case, he formed a new primary division for man only, under the name of *archencephala* (ruling brain, or brain-ruler). His deduction was, that there are three parts of the brain, the "posterior lobe", the "posterior corner", and the "hippocampus", which are "peculiar to and characteristic" of the human brain, and separate man by structure from the anthropoids.

This principle has been opposed on two grounds: one, is the insufficiency of any one organ to be the *characteristic* of man; and the other is the denial of the statement, and the production of proof that these parts of the brain are more prominent in some apes than in man.

It was stated at the meeting of the British Association, by Professor Huxley, another high authority, that he and others had presented this evidence in all fulness; that discussions on the minute differences in the brains or any other part, as a foot or hand, could not lead to any satisfactory result; and that the *real differences* are found in their "intellectual and moral powers". This last declaration is the very doctrine promulgated by Aristotle so long before our era.*

Gratiolet, on the continent, has great reputation on this subject, from his examination of the brains of the *anthropoids* and *microcephals*. The last is the class of *idiots*, from the smallness of heads or from the stunted growth of the brain. He states that the brain of microcephals, while it is less than that of the gorilla or orang-outan, is "still the habitation of a speaking soul. This innate, and as it were inextinguishable quality, is man's highest and most distinctive feature; and however lowered by disease or imbecility, man is still human, not an ape". Gratiolet's important conclusion from the whole is, that "man is separated from animals as completely by his physical organism as he is by his mental phenomena".†

Another highly extolled authority on the same subject, Dr. Wagner, agrees with Gratiolet, "that there is no absolute identification of the human brain, not even of microcephals, with the quadrumane brain". Another statement of the same author is, that "from all we know of the normal and abnormal

* *Silliman's Journal*, vol. xxxiv, pp. 440-441.

† Same vol. p. 192.

human and ape structure, the two are separated as widely as birds and mammals. . . . All I know of zoölogy and physiology is opposed to any such transmutation as Darwin suggests".*

This history is full of interest to the inquirer after truth. The declarations of some of the learned zoölogists in this brief review, show us that they hold man to be entirely distinct from animals by his structure and by his moral and intellectual powers. The advance already made indicates the wise direction of philosophic minds towards the palpable facts of the relative and superior, but peculiar endowments of man. While this indication from the foreign authors just noticed is so grateful, the same has just appeared in the extended geology of Professor J. D. Dana. Though an adherent to the classification of Cuvier in the general, he has separated man from all the other mammals by putting him into the primary division or sub-class, under the name "*Archonts*—man (alone)," or *Rulers*, and then classing the other mammals in three separate divisions. And he maintains that the geology of that period gave, and still gives, full announcement of the high powers of the *coming* man, which separate him from the mere animals. We know that Professor Dana assigns to man all those moral powers or endowments which are here maintained to distinguish him from the brutes. For he was on earth "the *first* (being) capable of deriving happiness from beauty, truth, and goodness; of apprehending eternal right; of looking from the finite towards the Infinite, and communing with God his Maker".†

The question now occurs how, with such high and truthful views of man, an intelligent naturalist can sanction, in the general, the structural zoölogy of Cuvier? The answer is, that the system is designed to be confined to the organic characters or properties of its subjects. This is the very solution given by Professor Dana: "Science, in searching out the system in nature, leaves psychical or intellectual qualities out of view; and this is right".‡ Let the "right" pass for the present, and it is clear that the system of Cuvier may be adopted as an easy and natural classification to such a mind, even though it has the most exalted views of the moral elevation of man. Such a naturalist studies zoölogy in its mere structural relations or animal aspects, excluding mental characters from the fundamental principles of the system, if not even from the

* *Silliman's Journal*, vol. xxxiv, p. 195. † *Dana's Geology*, pp. 573-4.

‡ *Silliman's Journal*, vol. xxxv, p. 65, for 1863.

lower divisions of it. Numbers of scientific men stand upon this ground, as they agree with Prof Dana in the statements already made. Were these views only declared and maintained, the science would not be exposed to the general condemnation of holding to the mere animal nature of man. We should then have the full admission of the distinct and superior characters of man, while mere zoölogy would be limited to the anatomical or physical and physiological constitution. This would be a great improvement, and would remove a great difficulty. The actual "two-fold constitution" of man, the material and the spiritual, would find a prominent place in our philosophy. The mental and moral powers of man would be treated of by their proper teachers, the psychologists, moralists, and theologians. This is the first and obvious answer to the question.

This explication, let it be observed, does not accord with the views of Prof. Agassiz; for he asserts, and attempts to prove, that man and animals have the *same* intellectual and psychical qualities *in kind*, and therefore these can not be used in the systematic arrangement, as they do not distinguish, but do even unite, man and animals in the same category.* He does hold man to be only an animal. In sorrow is it stated that he ignores the essential difference between intellectual and moral powers or characters, between brute consciousness and the sense of right and wrong, or moral obligation. This is the second general answer, and the real answer to this absurd view.

Besides the two methods, above considered, of sustaining the use of the system of Cuvier, there is only one other, and somewhat related to the first. It is that of being a convenient system for arrangement and descriptions, whether man and animals have any psychical characters or not, for they are not even to be referred to. This considers the system as a mere human contrivance, a natural method in the sense condemned by Prof. Agassiz†, because, though its facts are admitted, they have no reference to the wisdom of the Creator, but are merely classified for the arrangement of our knowledge, and for the more easy acquisition and expansion of it.

On these three methods some remarks are important, since in this discussion the objectists discover the Divine plan in the constitution of organized beings and the development of the highest exhibition of the Divine wisdom and benevolence.

In this view, the *last* method is unworthy of reception and

* Agassiz' *Essay on Classification*, pp. 65-66, etc.

† *Essay on Classification*, p. 8.

support, as it excludes all consideration of the noblest powers of our nature. Matter and organism is the *summum bonum* of such naturalists. This is a mere *zoic* consideration.

The *second* method, which is supported by Professor Agassiz, and may well be named the *anthropo-zoic* system, has been considered in the previous pages, and shown to be untenable in the view of common sense, as well as condemned by many distinguished naturalists, from Aristotle to the present day. It finds, as is hoped, few advocates or defenders anywhere. Besides the distinguished European names before introduced in this paper, a great number of naturalists might be mentioned in our country besides Prof. Dana, who fill high places in our colleges and other institutions, or are educated men, well qualified for a judicious conclusion on this subject.

The *first* method depends on structure for its fundamental principle and divisions, and is thus far that of Cuvier. As now held by Professor Owen and others, it involves the principle that the distinct structure of man is significant of the high intellectual and moral powers bestowed on him by his benevolent Creator. Were these characters of the soul or the spirit only made fundamental, the system would cease to be that of Cuvier, and be assimilated to the views of Aristotle, or the system of Ehrenberg, or of St. Hilaire, and would accord with the doctrines here maintained. As it is, its supporters can adopt and maintain the strongest views of the distinct and separate moral constitution of man.

To mention no others on the "psychical or intellectual qualities", Prof. Dana* says; "these immaterial characteristics have, in all cases, a material or structural expression: and when this expression is apprehended, and its true importance fully admitted, classification will not fail of its duty in recognizing the distinctions they indicate". And again, on "*The introduction of man*—the first being of moral and intellectual qualities, and in whom the unity of nature has its full expression".† Zoölogists of this school hold that the peculiar structure of man, which separates him from the animals, is indicative of higher endowments than could be adapted to an inferior structure and organization; or, to use the words of Prof. Dana, the intellectual and moral power "of man is thus expressed in his material structure. Man is, therefore, not one of the Primates alongside of the monkeys", as he had been ranked; but, "he stands alone—the Archont‡ of mammals". This speculation derives the high intellectual and moral

* *Silliman's Journal*, Vol. 35, p. 65, 1863.

† *Geology*, p. 742, and ‡ p. 573.

powers from, or exhibits them through, the structural form, and from the physiology of the upper extremities as being *cephalic*, and not *locomotive*, instruments. It was of such a highly organized body, acting out such new manifestations of powers, that Prof. Owen* uttered the following in the conclusion of his work on the Vertebrata: "Such are the dominating powers with which we, and we alone are gifted! This frame is a temporary trust, for the uses of which we are responsible to the Maker. Waste not its energies; dull them not by sloth; spoil them not by pleasures! The supreme work of Creation has been accomplished that you might possess a body—the sole erect—of all animal bodies most free—and for what? For the service of the soul. Think what it may become—the temple of the Holy Spirit!"

Let it be, that the *erect* form of man is the structural expression of that Divine image in which man was created,† as uttered by a wise man of old, "Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man *upright*", and that the abnormal action of the organs shows also that "they have sought out many inventions" or things opposed to rectitude: let it be true, that when the structural "expression is apprehended, the classification will not fail of its duty" to show the high and peculiar powers, physical and moral, which man possesses. Is this slow and obscure method, that which the Creator designs those made in his image shall pursue to a just knowledge of himself and of themselves? It can not be; it does not comport with the attributes revealed by his works. We can not say of such a system, which wholly excludes "intellectual and psychical characters"; "this is right". Especially should the moral sense, or religious principle, the highest endowment of man, and that one in which his likeness to the Divine Creator possesses the greatest importance and can be productive of the richest good, be introduced. No other basic principle is so simple, so easy, and so natural. Besides it is the most obvious way. For, the action of man immediately exhibits his moral power, and his noble and peculiar psychical characteristics. Men understood the true plan of man in the extended system of being on earth long before the Christian era,

* Vertebrata, p. 51.

† Since the above was written, Prof. Dana has fully presented his views of the "immeasurable" difference between man and animals, in that *spiritual element* which is "wholly distinct from any thing of a psychical or intellectual nature in the mere animal", and "through which, man bears God's image," and by which man is made "a moral being". It is the adoption of such views, long held by the great body of educated men and by most thinking minds, zoölogists or not, that *science falsely so-called* is made harmless.

and no doubt taught it also before the flood, and the first father must have shown it to his children, for it is enstamped on the very outer man and breathed forth from the inner. No parent could ever have said to his children that the young calf is your brother; and this lion is another; and that elephant is your grandfather, that horse is your uncle, and that she-bear is your aunt: and we are all of one animal race, and you possess the *same kind* of powers which distinguish us. Yes; one exception should be made; for *their* intimate relationship to the tribe of monkeys has always been maintained by the *Monboddites*. True, this is a modern family, and not yet extensively diffused. But it maintains very definite and dogmatic principles. Had father Monboddo met an aged orang or gorilla in the woods, he would have exclaimed with delight, "My dearly beloved and honored brother, uncle, grandsire, give me your hand; we are of one blood." The *Monboddites* were unknown to the Egyptians, Hebrews, Greeks and Romans, and no Sanscrit wisdom is yet known to have spoken of them. The true system however is old as man, so prominent are its characters. But the structural system, on the other hand, has required centuries of progress to develop it, and is now passing through a fiery ordeal, by which it will probably be consumed. This result is devoutly to be desired. Then will mind and heart have their true position in philosophy, as in nature and Divine Providence.

To this the scientific world will ultimately come, as exhibiting the Divine plan in creation. No other will be admitted to be satisfactory, and accordant with the highest wisdom. Some will maintain that the zoölogist has not at present discovered an unexceptionable method of arrangement which may supersede that of Cuvier in the general; that vertebrates, articulates, molluscates, and radiates, actually exist, and man *is a vertebrate*; that of vertebrates, there are mammals, birds, reptiles, and fishes, and man *is a mammal*; that of mammals, there are ungulates, ungulates, and mutilates, and man *is an ungulate*; that of ungulates, there are bimana, quadrumana, cheiroptera, &c., and man is the *only form of the bimana*. Let all this be admitted; but is this system of Cuvier the wisest and the best? The stamens, pistils, and seed-vessels, are the same, and as necessary and abundant as when they entered into the classification of plants and were the ground-work of the botanical system of Linnæus; but they remain, while his beautiful and attractive artificial system belongs only to history. So it should be the effort of zoölogists to evolve the distinctions which separate man from animals;

and they should tolerate the system of Cuvier only till a superior classification is formed, leaving that of Cuvier also to history. Indeed, would it not be preferable to have the system based upon broad eternal differences in fact, than upon a principle so liable to misconception and abuse, even if the latter seemed to be more logical? Let man fill the place required by his distinguishing properties which separate him from all other creatures of life, and with that great fact let the system be made consistent. So rational and clear is this, that opposition to it is absurdity and derogation to the Creator and his works.

Above all, let no one be deceived by the dogma that only the *structural* classification is *natural*, as is implied in the statement of Prof. Agassiz. For organism is *natural* in the same sense as is inorganic matter; the powers of animal life are *natural* precisely as is vegetative life, or the mind of the animal is *natural* in the same respect as the life of the vegetable; and, the soul, or the moral power of man, is *natural* precisely as is the sensation and volition of the brute, or the intellect and lingual powers of man. It is natural for animals to act according to their powers and instincts; and equally natural for man to act according to his endowments. For the horse to neigh, the bird to sing, and for the man to reason, to feel the approbation or condemnation of conscience, or to be sensible to moral obligation and the duty of gratitude and praise to the Infinite Spirit, is also natural. Properties or powers of mind and heart, form as definite and finely-marked distinctions as do those of structure and organization. In the earlier stages of society, or before natural science can have made any considerable progress, these powers of intellect and soul must be the ground-work of systematic divisions of men and animals. So, *in fact*, it has been proved to be in the migrations, science, and progress of nations. The mere animal has held the same rank, compared with man, it now does, namely, immeasurably inferior to that of man. In the history of nations, Divine Providence has put its stamp of certainty on the correct estimate of animals by man among the civilized and uncivilized, among the nations earliest on record and those of the latest discovery, in the islands of the Pacific and in the midst of Africa.

ART. III.—DORNER ON THE SINLESS PERFECTION OF JESUS.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 280.)

IV. *The significance of the sinlessness of Jesus for Christian apologetics.*

EVERY intellectually active age sees new sides in the person of Christ; sides which possess power to heal the evils recently arisen in society, and to overcome new popular errors. These attacks must contribute to the church's own enrichment and self-confirmation. They arouse from the slumber of traditional custom, which supposes that it holds possession of that which can have a living presence only by means of constant spiritual toil, and which can be a complete, harmonious, and secure possession only as it is a living present reality. It is the privilege of the gospel that its opponents are obliged to fix intently the disciples' gaze on that by which they themselves may be overthrown, *i. e.*, may be won.

In the earlier centuries there was among mankind a more lively sense of God, or at least a more lively craving for God, than is, in many ways, to be found at present. The old world's despair of itself was the end of its mediate or direct deification of the world. The general decay of human things, and misery, drove the heathen world to God, and to his revelation in Christ. In this revelation it was *the Divine* for which it had most directly an open eye; more precisely, it was the divine on that side which distinguishes it most from the human, in its perishableness, its chaos, and its misery; that is, it was the might and majesty, the glory and blessedness of God; and the most intensive piety of the first centuries was more a fleeing from this world as a vain show to God, than a use of the present world, animated by Christian principles.

To this characteristic trait of ancient Christianity, which had to fix its seat amid expiring nationalities, there seems to be a strong contrast made by the youthful world of the migratory northern nations, as they pressed with energy into the midst of this old world. But the latter enjoyed what I would almost call the natural blessing of a youthful age, — at least the young nations historically most important had this, — namely, a lively sense of God, and a craving for God; and

entered willingly into the school and the discipline of the ancient church, according to which, men and virgins who had devoted their lives to God took rank above knights and noble matrons; nay, chivalry and imperialism became in part, even spiritually, the church's arm, by their vow of obedience. Not only was wholesome discipline established; not only were the wild shoots of these hardy children of nature pruned; but the church made an incision into the normal and divinely-constituted life of nature, as if it were theirs to annihilate the human, that nothing but the divine might be current. Not only were the earthy and moral spheres of life depreciated, and robbed of independent significance,—all worth, nay, all true reality being placed solely in the church, which sacrificed to God or transubstantiated all that is earthy; but revelation itself, and above all, its consummation in Christ, was divested of its HUMAN character; the omnipotent majesty of Christ, his legislative and judicial holiness being alone in their thoughts. The human friendship and the human tenderness of his nature were transferred to Mary and the saints.

So long as this immediate, and as it were natural, but quite indefinite sense of God, fed by the devotional life of the church, preponderated among mankind,—the feeling of general and deep reverence for God's holy, annihilating, omnipresent majesty, before which all finite being is valueless and as nothing,—there were in the prevailing mood of mankind grounds which (where Christianity must needs be proved by arguments) had a lively sense for the evidence of miracles. The mind was prepared to see miracles breaking forth at every moment and everywhere, and to see in them the omnipotence and majesty of God, and in this mood willingly believed the credibly-reported miracles of Scripture. What they proved in their own nature was, indeed, nothing but the majesty and *power of God*, exalted above the powers of mankind and of nature, but this passed for the divine *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, and the deficiency perhaps felt as to the certainty of the testimonies from antiquity for miracles was richly compensated by the belief in the miracles continued in the church.*

What a wholly different turn the matter has taken in the last centuries, and how much has the feeling altered, especially in the Protestant world! How many believing Protestants

* The proof from prophecy, too, in its usual acceptation, was properly nothing but a proof of the *power* of God as opposed to accident, and revealed so little the unity and constancy of God's chief end in the world that, on the contrary, the most trivial occurrence in detail appeared to lend more stringency to this proof than what is most important and indispensable to God's chief end in the world

who hold fast the miracles of Christ have come to faith in Christ, not *by* his miracles, but, so to speak, *in spite* of them; because, the more the philosophical sense has been cultivated, the more (that is, so long as they were considered acts of omnipotence, but not equally acts of a disposing divine wisdom, and unconnected with the ultimate and absolute scope of the universe), the more did miracles stand opposed to the whole weight of the firm and regular laws of nature, nay, to the entire position of the children of this age, which sees in the visible universe a well-ordered and momentous reality, with its own life, its own meaning, and not a mere cover of a miracle-world lying behind and seeming to be a world of arbitrary will.

One has a good right to call the nearly dominant mode of contemplating the world in the physical researches of the day a dead mode, denuded of God, wanting ideality, and narrow. But it cannot be denied that, on the other hand, it has a more concrete, truer insight into the connection of the powers of the world, and of their operations and laws, than the old, and, so to speak, one-sided theological view of the universe. Whoever now stands true in the Christian faith, denies no actual fact to defend the faith. It is rather the infinite elasticity of Christianity to derive advantage from every real advance of human knowledge, and to apply it as an impulse to purify man, and to reveal new sides of the glory of the gospel. The world-despising idealism has, as Oetinger already perceived, done so much damage to true theology, and so much does it obstruct even to this day, the historical view of Christianity, that theology may well see in it a summons to give greater significance to the actual world; and the recent mutation of idealism into materialism, which would hardly have been effected had the importance of matter and of the terrestrial world found *more* correct appreciation in theology and philosophy, points to the same task. To this we are summoned also by the undeniable fact, that the divine work of the Reformation is closely connected with that revolution, and with the advance of the physical sciences.

It is true that *Faith*, the heart's love of the Reformation, soars beyond the visible to find its rest and its life in the living God, revealed in Christ. It seeks and finds its true citizenship in heaven. But heaven is to it no longer a remote thing *in eternity*, as it was to the middle ages: it has heaven open, nay faith has heaven already *in* itself. It is only by a death that this heaven can be entered, and not by penances hostile to life, which fill up this life and a vast part of the

future; but, by *Repentance* and *Faith*; and a commencement of the resurrection to a new life falls already in this life. Though faith, moreover, in this world, "possesses as though it possessed not", as far as it is directed to a future goal, the city of God, the new Jerusalem which is above, yet its whole value does not lie in eternity. Since heaven has descended into the heart, and Christ has made believers his own members, these know that something valuable is already to be found upon earth. The very personality of the man in whom Christ's Spirit dwells is already in this world something ennobled by divine love, and has thus a truly immeasurable value in the eyes of this love—a value not by transmutation into the divine and loss of personal character, but, on the very contrary, by the perfecting of the creation already begun in time. Hence it is self-evident what importance man's earthly life, or the time-side, has won in this point of view, and what importance anthropology has gained alongside of theology, which previously well nigh discerned in God nothing but the majesty of holy power. In the Reformation view of faith, there lay the germ of a new view of God; but this did not at once obtain free development. On the contrary, the human mind in the Protestant world cast itself with all its aspirations and power upon the attainment of the knowledge of man and of the salvation made for him, of mind and physical nature, and upon the investigation and mastery of the stage here given to our race as its possession.

It is true, I repeat, that the study of nature, and the entire empirico-realistic direction taken by science has in part assumed an ungodly character. Forgetting the whence and the whither, it has shut itself up in a self-created prison, and praised and extolled it as the land of liberty. It has forgotten that it is the gospel by which mankind was raised erect again in Christian nations, and the power was recovered by which even secular opinion subsists in its progressive culture. For the life-principle of human culture is worship. Still it remains true that, since the Reformation, the eyes of mankind have opened to the present world, to its history and its nature, in a measure unknown before, and that it takes possession of the world with a success never before equalled in intellectual knowledge and practical conquest. This turn in universal history cannot be wrenched back. Our business is to adapt ourselves to it, and turn it to account as the gospel intends.

In the opinion of antiquity, the world still hovered between

being and non-being.* A world not yet conscious of eternal life in itself, although having in it the breath of religion, could not yet attain to the firm persuasion that it was a real quantity having a relative independence in relation to God: men's minds could not fully deal in earnest with the thought of a real creation, when the intensest mystic piety ever afresh substituted unconsciously annihilation in God for the world's final goal. The God of majesty, the God of absolute power, was always akin to this mode of thought, and viewed predominantly as nothing but holy power, which, as "*summum liberum arbitrium*", could any moment break, suspend, annihilate any order, any existence, any law (according to some even the moral law, which he had given to us).

Now our men of physical science, who everywhere must needs seek constancy, law, and order, and are conscious of perceiving in all this what is truly divine and worthy of God, come into keen conflict with this conception of God, with which unhappily a large section of evangelical theologians long continued satisfied. Nay, they turn away from the living God of the gospel as a God of arbitrariness and disorder. Thus the very thing that was specially asserted as a proof of the divinity of Christianity—namely, miracles—appeared to them more and more as something unworthy of God; nay, even if the fact of miracles could be conceded, they saw therein something contrary to God, a sign of an unregulated power, of a liberty which was rather caprice, while the rising natural theology was conscious (and in one respect justly so) of possessing a higher conception of God. But yet this God of natural theology, not having any absolute historical ends, could only become either a dead iron law according to which the world-machine runs its course, or (where men will have a more living idea) the essence of the living world itself, in a pantheistic sense; and thus men would return to the heathen doctrine of materialism. But the heathen have no hope. Were it conceivable that a people should lapse again into naturalistic pantheism, this world would again become to them a chaos, without form and void, so that the dreams of their essential divinity would perish just as in the old heathen world before Christ; and instead of finding in themselves the true satisfying reality, they would long for nothing except death, or to throw away their existence, in order to reach the divine, just as we notice this still in millions among the Brahmanical and Buddhist heathen.

* Let the reader recall the doctrine of creation by Augustine, Anselm, and even Thomas Aquinas.

But if the Reformation emancipated men's mind, so as to view the world, and enter it as into a reality which has a value and object in itself even in time — if the Reformation has effected this, that the human mind, passing from the position of childhood and bondage, can go on its way freely, and, according to its own decision, it is particularly incumbent on the church of the Reformation to direct this decision to the right goal. This she can only do by the unfolding more and more fully of Christian truth; and only where she neglects this, and as far as she neglects it, will the antichristian tendencies, which, under the guise of progress, are ever a falling back to pre-Christian platforms, assume an alarming compass and character.

In the treasuries of the gospel, which are the property of the Reformation faith, and of which it has the key, are contained, as we have said, the weapons of offence and defence, even for this new disposition of mind. Had the new doctrine of God hid in the reformed principle been earlier disengaged, had the idea of man as made in the image of God been on all sides worked out agreeably to it, theology could hardly ever have seen the highest element in God's omnipotence and sovereign power; it could hardly have seen in the miracles of power as such the brightest seal of the divine; it could hardly have come into such serious collision with the powerfully-awakened philosophy, nay, with the idea of the divine order and wisdom.

The Reformation point of view places not the *miracles of power*, but the *miracles of love*, in the centre of its contemplation (not however, without giving their due place and their due elucidation to the former, as far as they are historically attested); and in these miracles of love the actual world, mankind needing redemption and called to holiness, has a direct and immediate interest. These miracles cannot give rise even to the appearance of calling in question the reality of the world, and the good and regular order of the world; they are the affirmation and the confirmation of the position that the world of mankind is the ultimate object of God's love.

What evangelical faith teaches is this: that the power of God is not the inmost centre of his being, but that his *holy love* is a power above his omnipotence, and that it wisely employs this power for an end absolutely good — the creation of a real world of love. To an intelligent faith, God inwardly manifests himself, not simply as he does to the heathen, as the power on whose bare will we are absolutely dependent, — nor simply as a Lord and ruler who, as a holy Lawgiver and Judge, de-

mands our services,—but as holy self-communicating love, which proposed to itself, even at the creation of the world, something else as its end, and that is the bringing into being of loving persons made in its own image. And to realize this end, divine love entered into the world constantly and immutably, and yet with fulness of life, ordering everything to this one supreme goal, and avoiding arbitrariness, and an empty display of power without good cause. Thus no order and no law can prevent the manifestation of the inward and outward physical miracles of God's holy and wise love. Rather, every thing must ultimately minister to this one unalterable end, for the sake of which the world itself exists, and to whose power it is indebted. Everything, whether in the higher or lower order of the world's laws, must be incorporated in this world-plan. Thus evangelical faith is by no means unfriendly to miracle. It teaches us to appreciate the value of the real earthly world-order, and to engraft it into a higher order, the world of absolute aims. It thus recognises the true foundation of miracle in the absolute, *i. e.*, the ethical world-plan. But on this account, outward physical miracles can no longer form the foundation by themselves. They await the confirmation of their own possibility from the higher, the ethical world, though the attested records of their reality serve to extend and elevate the narrow earthly sense of the natural man.

Man, however, corresponds to the end for which he was created, when, conscious of his reconciliation to God, he allows room and place within him for the spirit of love, so that he honors God not merely on account of his benefits—even the heathen honor the gods for the sake of expected benefits—but thanks and praises him as the God and Father of all; offers himself as a means and instrument for his glory; seeks him and his kingdom as his own end, even as God in condescension sought man's salvation and glorification. When the Christian, reconciled and saved in Christ, learns to regard himself as the personal instrument of God, nature, too, wins for him its true position: he habituates himself to view it as the instrument, his own personality as a means to the ethical world-plan of God.

When thus viewed in its organic connexions with the true view of the universe, the idea of *nature* is made available for effacing both the dread of miracles and the idolatry of miracles.*

* [Dr. Dorner's argument, at some points, seems to undervalue the real position of miracles among the Christian evidences. An able vindication of the contrasted view is given by Dr. Skinner in the last number of our REVIEW.—Eds.]

By the tendency of men's minds to Anthropology, to the actual world, and to nature, dating from the Reformation, the intensity of the natural belief in God has certainly suffered an interruption. Self-consciousness gained strength in sobriety and clearness. Reflection, the life of rational thought, began to depart from the traditional piety, and its *naïveté* was destroyed. But the loss may be, and ought to be, repaired. Self-consciousness, diving into its depths, becomes self-knowledge, in a moral and religious sense. The *consciousness* of alienation from God is a higher stage, and one more accordant with the truth than a superficial and seeming union with God; and it was superficial as long as it was predominantly nothing but a consciousness of absolute dependence on God's *power*, little mindful of the existing dissent and the ethical and religious problems. But when this universal human feeling about God's power and majesty, before which we are but dust and ashes, and without any real, firm being, is conjoined with that moral consciousness, which results only from the persuasion of an ideal personal destination, (from the *ἐπίγνωσις νόμου*), the difference between God and man, in the first place, is certainly deepened. By God's holiness we find ourselves *morally annihilated*, rejected, and unworthy of blessed union with God. But this beginning of the ethical knowledge of God, on the ground of an awakening conscience, leads further, through the operation of the Spirit of God. If the holy *law* is dividing, cold, exacting, judging, the *Gospel*, on the other hand, reveals God's ethical nature in all its fulness; and now there begins, for the first time, a deeper and more intense fellowship with God, including personal holiness, as God's end, and the outer world as its means. The most divine element in God, if we may say so, now shows itself at once as the most humanly accessible, and as the nearest; while mere holy power appears to the carnal mind as indeed the highest, but in itself it can only cast us into a fruitless feeling of impotency and distance from God.

The appearance of Christ is the divine miracle of love absolutely, but so formed that the miracle appeared as true nature, as a *human life of love*, to lead us through itself to its inner divine source. By other means, indeed, than by himself—*e. g.*, by miracles of knowledge or of action—he sought to draw us to himself; but yet he emphasizes Himself as the way absolutely, leading to Him as the truth and the life, (John xiv, 6). Hence it stands most intimately connected with the history of evangelical theology and with its deepest interests, that the later theology fixes its eye specially on this personal appear-

ance of Christ and on his entire ethical character; and from this point of view finds for an active conscience, a surer transition to the knowledge of his divine dignity and his office as Redeemer, than in the proof from miracles, *e. g.*, from the resurrection (the favorite mode in England), or in prophecy, and the inspiration of Scripture, or in the perfection of his doctrine. True holiness, moral perfection, reaching to heaven in its depths, nay, into the very sphere of the divine ontology, has in it, on the other side, the charm of being the most humanly alluring, the most melodious, and the most resistlessly attractive, even for susceptible minds who are still strangers to the faith.

ART. IV.—THE CROWN OF LIFE IN JAMES I, 12.

[From the German of E. ZELLER in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Erstes Heft, 1863.]

JAMES i, 12: *Blessed is the man that endureth temptation; for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which [the Lord] hath promised to them that love him.* The inquiry of interpreters has been, *Who* promised this crown of life? Some reply, God; others, Christ; and in most manuscripts *ὁ χύριος*, or *θεὸς* is put after *ἐπηγγέλαιο*. One of the two must, in fact, be supplied; but for the sense and connexion it is quite indifferent which is preferred.

Much more important, however, is the question, *where* this crown of life (*στέφανος ζωῆς*) is promised? This inquiry, if I do not err, has not been started by any one of the commentators: Wiesinger alone alludes to it in passing. It seems to have been taken for granted, that the words do not refer to any definite promise, but only declare the general doctrinal belief in a future reward for Christian steadfastness. But the form of expression—*the crown of life, which he hath promised*—is quite too peculiar to be passed over so lightly. Any unprejudiced reader would at once be led to suppose that there was some definite promise, having respect, not to future blessedness or eternal life in a general sense, but in a special way to the *crown of life*; and this all the more, since the perfect tense (*ἡπηγγέλται*) is not used, but the aorist (*ἡπηγγέλαιο*), the tense of narrative, referring to some definite fact. Thus in this epistle, chapter ii, verse 5, we have the same form and turn of

expression—the kingdom which he hath promised (ἡπαγγέλατο) to them that love him—which unquestionably refers to a definite promise, viz., that in the Sermon on the Mount (as given in Matth. v, 3): “Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven”; nor need we here inquire, whether this was known to the writer by oral or written tradition, and, if the latter, whether from Matthew’s Gospel or some other source.

Where, now, are we to look for the promise which our text has in view? Some passage of the Old Testament would naturally be first thought of; but we seek here in vain for expressions which James might have had in mind. Zechariah vi, 14, in the Septuagint version comes the nearest (on the conjectures as to the Hebrew text, see Hitzig in locum); it reads: *The crown shall be to the patient, etc.*; but the resemblance is remote, for the peculiar addition—*of life*—is lacking. Still less pertinent is the passage in the apocryphal book, the Wisdom of Solomon, v, 17: “Therefore they [the just] shall receive the kingdom of glory and the diadem of beauty from the hand of the Lord”.

The origin of the passage may also be sought in the evangelical tradition. Nor can it be denied that the author of the epistle may have referred to a promise of the Lord, no where else reported: as in Acts xx, 35, and in several other citations, not found in the canonical books. But this conjecture ceases to be probable, if there be any passage in the New Testament scriptures, in which *the crown of life* is promised. And this is in fact the case. The words are so near at hand, that they are uniformly cited to be by all interpreters in illustration of our text; only they have hitherto failed to note an express relation between them.

They occur in the well known passage of the Revelation ii, 10: *Behold the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days; be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life*—τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς. That this passage, and no other, is in the mind of the writer seems probable for more than one reason. First, it is the only declaration known to us, in which *the crown of life* is promised: and to such a promise James directly refers. Again, it is a natural conjecture that the writer of the Apocalypse first made use of the phrase *the crown of life*, perhaps with reference to *the crown* in Zechariah; since he brings the crown of life into most express contrast with faithfulness, even unto death, and thus gives a peculiar form of expression to the idea already expressed by Jesus Christ in Matthew, x,

39: "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it". In fine, both passages also agree in what follows: James says, that the man who endureth temptation is blessed; so, too, John speaks of those who are tried by the devil: the former promises the crown of life to him who is tried, the latter to him who is faithful unto death. The only difference is, that in the Apocalypse a definite situation is taken for granted, that is, the last conflict between Christ and Anti-Christ, and the persecutions preceding this struggle, with imprisonment and martyrdom; in James, on the other hand, this definite historical background is wanting, and the apocalyptic exhortation, which refers to a sharply delineated issue, fades away into a general moral warning. Hence we must not be misled by the fact that in the Apocalypse we do not find the words — *to them that love him*, by which James denotes those to whom the promise applies. This is an addition of the writer, just like that which he makes in chapter ii, vs. 5 to the promise made in the Sermon on the Mount (Matth. v, 3) to the poor in spirit; because he adduces the words, not in their original, concrete application, but in the most general sense, in which they are applicable, as is the case with every promise that has respect to future reward; for every word of promise holds true of those whom God loves.

As it is thus proved, that the connection of these two passages is not accidental, so, too, it is evident, that James must have cited the Apocalypse, and not the Apocalypse James. For in the Revelation is an original freshness of expression; it is uttered in the midst of clear, historical circumstances, by which its peculiar form and force are determined; it gives a promise to which James refers as having been made. Where all indications thus concur, no doubt is possible as to which is the copy, and which the original.

If the result of this investigation be confirmed, we shall have gained, not only a decisive date upon the question of the genuineness of the Epistle to James and the time when it was written, but also a valuable testimony to the Apocalypse, such as cannot be supplied by any other of equal antiquity.

ART. V.—PRAYER AND MEDIATION.

By HON. ELEAZER LORD, Piermont, N. Y.

No subject perhaps of equal concern to man, has been less satisfactorily written upon than that of Prayer; whether considered with respect to the reasons for the exercise of it or the grounds on which the duty is acceptably performed. We propose to consider the subject only in relation to some of its primary conditions and requisites, especially those which involve the necessity and the fact of Mediation—an actual Mediator, between the infinitely holy Being to whom petitions are presented, and sinful creatures from whom and on whose behalf they are offered.

It is apparent from the nature of the case, that the chasm between the parties—the Infinite, and the finite, the holy God, and creatures polluted and guilty,—is such as to preclude the idea of any such intercourse between them, or any ground of such direct appeal of the one to the other, independently and aside from Mediation, as is implied in acceptable prayer. The creature, conscious of ignorance and guilt, naturally discerns the necessity of an intermediate helper, a Mediator. He needs an advocate, a propitiator—one acting in immediate relation to both parties, who can answer for him, expiate his guilt, adopt and present his petitions, and obviate his disabilities. But he cannot invoke the aid of such an one, and offer petitions to be presented by him, or have faith in him, unless he apprehends him as the officiating Mediator, and understands something of the nature and sufficiency of his vicarious acts. To suppose a suppliant to present his petitions—not to and through one acting in such mediatorial capacity, not in his name and by faith in his person and mediation—but directly to the offended God, would be to suppose that mediation was not indispensable to fallen man. It would be to suppose the entire theory and fabric of Christianity to have no real foundation. It is the very basis of the Christian system, that there is One Mediator between God and man, through whom alone and by faith in whom man can have access to God by prayer, and be the recipient of pardon and salvation. This must have been as true when man first fell as at any subsequent period. The Scriptures teach

but one way of life. The teachings of the Old Testament are consistent with those of the New. The church of the redeemed is one under all dispensations,—justified and saved through faith in the one Mediator.

In every aspect of the case the acceptableness and efficacy of prayers must depend on the qualification, disposition and official action of the Mediator; on his concurring in the petitions offered, adopting them as his own, presenting them himself at the throne of grace with his own vicarious, propitiatory, and intercessory acts and pledges proffered on behalf of the suppliant. As Mediator he takes the part of the penitent petitioner, assumes his obligation to punishment, becomes his legal substitute in the case and fulfils the terms of satisfaction; and on the other hand, takes the part of the offended Lawgiver, and of holiness and legal righteousness, against the impenitent. Of the one he is the Advocate, Intercessor, Redeemer, Saviour: of the other the final Judge. The prayers of the one are accepted solely by reason of the concurrent official vicarious action of the Mediator. The prayers of the other, wanting that concurrent Mediatorial efficiency, are vain and fruitless. The one, conscious of guilt, accepts the offered mediation, and is by faith united to him, and is heard and saved, solely through and by reason of his mediatory acts in his official and covenant relations. The other, alien to all this, continues under condemnation. But if this be a just view of the subject, and if at present such concurrent mediation is necessary to acceptable prayer, how can it be possible that the same conditions and reciprocal agencies were not equally indispensable to all who were justified under the ancient dispensations?

Here we encounter the embarrassing fact, that although the Old and New Testaments teach the same doctrine of justification and life through faith in the One Mediator, and although patriarchs and prophets were actually justified and saved through their union to the Mediator by that faith, theological writers generally teach, that the Mediator did not assume his office or act mediatorially in any respect till the introduction of the Christian dispensation; that the Second Person of the Trinity who became incarnate in man's nature then only was invested with and exercised the office of Mediator; that under the prior dispensations he was referred to only as the Messiah who was to appear at a future time; that his future coming and acting mediatorially was known simply as matter of prediction and typical representation; and that the efficacy of his mediatorial acts in respect to the justification and salvation of

believers, was future and simply retrospective in relation to the Old Testament saints.

This construction, though generally acquiesced in, is, we apprehend, obnoxious to very serious objections, to some of which we purpose to refer, without pursuing the subject controversially.

In general such a construction appears to imply a far too restricted view of the nature and objects of mediation. From the relation of all the phenomena, physical and spiritual, in the sphere of the finite, to "the church" and the work of redemption, it would seem far more obviously in accordance with the Scriptures, to regard the dependent universe and all creatures, and the preservation and government of all, as due to Mediatorial agency; as the work of the mediatorial Person, who at the appointed time assumed man's nature, than to regard it as in part his work, and in part that of the absolute Deity, as a unity, or that of the Father as a Person of the Godhead. Of the Mediator, as he appeared incarnate, it is expressly affirmed that he created all things in heaven and earth, that he preserves them all, that he is heir to all, and Head over all, the first and the last—and considering that as a Person—or as to what constituted his Personality—he was the same before as after he took man's nature into union with his Person; that it was as a Person that he became incarnate; and that it was the Personal Logos who was in the beginning, and was God, by whom all things were made, it is certain that there was connected with his appointment and office a qualification to act Mediatorially, a ground of relation to creatures, a ground of action on his part in finite relations and under the conditions of time and space. That the Personal Logos who was in the beginning and who made all things, was the mediatorial Person, is determined by the announcements that he became incarnate (John i.), and that at his second coming in his glorified human nature, his name is to be called "the Logos of God." If then, the mediatorial Person, under the designations which distinguish his delegated, official character, created and governs all things: then he was in a capacity as Mediator, to act as administrator and head over all things in reference to his church, and as such to be the object of faith and prayer under the ancient economy as truly as under the present.

The Greek term *Logos* is the equivalent of the Hebrew term, *Dabar*, and the English, *Word*. In the New Testament the Greek term is translated *Word*, as a personal designation of the Mediator. John i.—1 John 1: i. 5: 4.—Rev. xix: 13. In

Hebrew, *Dabar*, is evidently employed with a personal reference, and in connections and with reference to actions, which can point to no other than the same official Person, although our common version is not always clear to that effect. Thus, '*Dabar Jehovah came* unto Abram saying, Fear not, Abram: *I am thy shield* &c., and Abram said, O, Adonai Jehovah, what wilt thou give me' &c. Gen. xv : 1, 2. In v 5-7 it is said that "*Dabar Jehovah brought Abram forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, &c—and he believed in the Jehovah, and he counted it to him for righteousness. And he said unto him, I am the Jehovah that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees.*" Next follows the preparation of a sacrifice by the direction of the Jehovah, the utterance by him of various promises and predictions, and the ratifying of the covenant then made, by the offering of the sacrifice, on the one part, and by a customary token of acceptance on the other, the consumption of it by fire. Whatever of figure there may have been in this scene, the sense is that a Divine Person under the title of *Dabar*—Logos, Word,—*Dabar Jehovah*,—came to Abram, gave him instructions and promises, entered into covenant with him, accepted his offering, and justified him. Abram believed in *him* and *he* counted, imputed righteousness to, Abram.

When the Jehovah had called to Samuel at intervals, it is said, "*And the Jehovah came and stood and called as at other times, Samuel, Samuel. And the Jehovah appeared again in Shiloh: for the Jehovah revealed himself to Samuel by the Dabar Jehovah.*" 1 Sam. iii : 10, 21. "*Then came Dabar Jehovah unto Samuel, saying.*" &c. *ibid* xv : 10. This formula is of frequent occurrence. "*Dabar Jehovah came expressly unto Ezekiel by the river Chebar.*" Then follows his vision of the glory of the Jehovah, in the similitude of Man. "*And he said unto me, Son of man, stand upon thy feet, and I will speak unto thee.*" i : 3,—ii : 1. The same formula recurs some 50 times in the course of his prophecy.

That the personal reference of this phraseology was familiar to the Patriarchal and early Jewish church, is evinced by the Chaldee paraphrasts, who, laboring to revive that primitive faith, inserted their term *Memra*, the Chaldee equivalent for *Dabar*, Logos, and Word, before the name Jehovah in very numerous instances, from the beginning of Genesis onward; that wherever any local or personal action is ascribed to the Jehovah it should be understood to be ascribed to the mediatorial Person—the mediating Jehovah—the *Dabar*, the Logos, the Word. Such a course on their part, and on behalf of the remnant of believing Israelites, whether considered as traditional from the

time of Ezra, or as extant in writing only after the Advent, would, considering the antagonist constructions and the unbelief of the Jews in general, have been incredible and impossible, had they not believed it to be agreeable to the teachings of Moses and the prophets. It is moreover undeniable, that, to a considerable extent, the same acts which are in the Old Testament expressly ascribed to the Jehovah, are also ascribed to the mediatorial Person, as designated by the terms, Logos, Messenger, Immanuel, Messiah.

So far as the Scriptures instruct us, the Divine Being does not act externally or towards creatures, as a Unity. The Scriptures teach that there are three coequal Persons in the Godhead; and they expressly, or by just construction, ascribe each Divine act to one or to another of those Persons. All Divine acts are personal; they are acts of the Father, or of the Son, or of the Holy Spirit. All mediatorial acts are acts of the Second Person in his mediatorial office and character; and since he sustained that office and character in the beginning, and in virtue of it created the worlds, and all things, we may be sure that he did not assume his office and commence his mediatorial work at the commencement of the Christian dispensation.

Again, the view in question overlooks, so far as relates to the period between the Fall of man and the Advent, a principal object of the Mediatorial appointment and agency, namely, that of thwarting and vanquishing Satan, the arch leader of rebellion. That great antagonist of the Mediatorial Person, whose final destruction is to be effected by the Logos at his second coming, (Rev. xix) commenced his career of opposition at the date of the Fall. But, according to this view, resistance to him by his eventual conqueror was deferred throughout the period of Old Testament history. His enmity and opposition were directed specially against the mediatorial Person, the second Adam. He had seduced and triumphed over the first Adam, and thenceforth it was his aim and only hope to maintain his sway over all the race of man, and to defeat and overcome the second Adam—the Jehovah from heaven (1 Cor. xv: 47.) on his advent as man. Hence the temptation of the wilderness. The facts, that it was by his direct personal agency that he wrought upon the first Adam, and that in the signal instance in the wilderness it was by the direct personal agency of the second Adam that he was resisted, sufficiently indicate the personal reference and character of the antagonism from the beginning. But if, between the Fall and the Advent the

Divine Person who at an appointed time in the progress of his work, was to assume man's nature, exerted no antagonistic agency; if, while predicted and typified as thereafter to appear incarnate, he exerted in his delegated, mediatorial character and office, no agency under his name Jehovah,—then we must conclude that the administration of Providence, the theophanies, the theocratic rule, and all the details of familiar intercourse with men during the interval, as well as all acts specially antagonist to Satan, are to be ascribed to the Deity, as a Unit, or else to the Father personally, whom we are assured no man hath seen or can see, and who is revealed and represented only by the Son, as Mediator.

From the view in question, it follows that the prayers and praises of the ancient church, were addressed directly to the Deity as a Unit, or else to the Father, without reference to any mediation, long prior to the appointment and official agency of a mediator. There could have been no personal relation, no ground of sympathy, no mutual interest, between the ancient saint, seeking life and deliverance from the power of Satan, and a Mediator not then appointed to exercise his office. How could the suppliant present his prayers through an official Person, not yet invested with his office, not yet sent to perform it, a mediator between the offended God and the guilty suppliant? How could that Person as Mediator, prior to his entering on his office, intercede for the suppliant? The necessity of mediation is immediate. The effects of it must be realized while the suppliant is alive. They are gifts conferred by virtue and in consequence of the mediation through which he seeks them, i. e. by virtue and in consequence of acts performed, and of gifts of faith, repentance and pardon, then bestowed by the Mediator; for mediation between differing agents is mediatory action. To produce present effects, the mediation, the mediatory acts necessary to those effects, must be present. There doubtless are in the absence of Divine mediation as related to the moral and redemptive system, mediatory acts which, like that of the incarnation, and that of the atonement, were to occur but once, which had their appointed time and place in the system, were subjects of prophetic and typical representation, and of retrospective recognition and faith. But the offering of petitions through the Mediator to be presented by him and rendered effectual by his intercession, implies at every period the present exercise of his official agency. It is inconceivable that the want of such present agency could be supplied by faith in the predictions and types of any future mediatory acts; as inconceivable as that the ancient saints could have

been saved without any coincident personal action on *their* own part; or that specific effects should be produced by the concurrent action of two distinct agents, of whom one was neither present nor qualified to act. Predictions of the future appearance of the mediatorial Person visibly in man's nature, and types of his atoning sacrifice by the shedding of his own blood, were vividly significant of those particular events; but they could no more supersede the necessity of his other mediatory agencies under the ancient dispensation, than a simple belief that at the predicted time those facts occurred, can have that effect under the present economy.

Consider the prayers and the faith of the ancient saints, in relation to the chief benefit to be attained by them, namely justification, without which acceptance and sanctification could not result. "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone." By faith the sinner receives and rests upon the righteousness of another Person, who, by appointment, has become his legal surety and substitute, and undertaken in his stead to obey the law which he had broken, to expiate sin by suffering its penalty, and to effect the deliverance of the guilty by the imputation to him of the righteousness thus acquired and gratuitously bestowed. The faith embraces that Person in his mediatory offices and work, and the acquittal immediately ensues. It is the prerogative of that Person and a part of his mediatory work, "to give repentance and forgiveness of sins." Acts v: 31. "He is the author and finisher of our faith." Heb. xii: 2. The transaction involves on both sides present personal action. If then Abraham and the host of Old Test. saints were actually justified and therefore saved, and if the faith through which he was justified was the pattern of that through which believers now are justified, then the Mediator had entered on the execution of his office, and was entitled to perform the acts and bestow the gifts necessary to render faith in him effectual to the present justification of believers. Hence the language of trust in the Jehovah, the prayers for pardon, and the acknowledgments of mercy, so common in the Old Test. and especially in the Psalms. "Trust in the Jehovah, for in the Jehovah is everlasting strength." Isa. xxvi: 4. "Blessed is the man that maketh the Jehovah his trust." Ps. xl: 4. "Bless the Jehovah, O my soul—who forgiveth all thine iniquities." Ps. ciii: 1, 3. "Have mercy upon me, O Elohim, according to thy loving kindness; according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies,

blot out my transgressions." Ps. li : 1. "Out of the depths have I cried unto thee, O Jehovah. O Adonai hear my voice.—If thou Jehovah shouldst mark iniquities, O Adonai, who shall stand? But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared." Ps. cxxx : 12. In a word if there were *holy* men in the ancient church, they were made such through faith in the mediatorial Person as their Redeemer; and received mediatory gifts from him.

From these considerations the conclusion is just and necessary, that the Jehovah who administered the ancient economy was the Second Person of the Trinity, acting mediatorially from the beginning, and not only under that name, but also under the various appellations and titles which, interchangeably with that name, are appropriated to him, and, as designations indicate his mediatorial office, acts, or relations: as, the *Logos*; (Word, outward manifestation, image, representative) who was in the beginning, and made all things: the Messenger; (the Second Person of the Godhead, as Legate—the appellation indicating his local and visible appearances) the Redeemer: (Ransomer, Kinsman Redeemer, "the Jehovah thy Redeemer"—the title indicating his office under both Old and New Testaments) the Saviour; the Shepherd; the King; and others significant of his mediatorial offices. It is undeniable that under this name and its cognates, and under these titles, acts are ascribed to him in the Old Test. which are ascribed to the Messiah in the New. Compare the following passages: "In the beginning *Elohim* created the heavens and the earth." Gen. i. "Thus saith the *Jehovah* that created the heavens, *the Elohim* himself that formed the earth and made it—I am the *Jehovah* and there is none else." Isa. xlv : 18. "The *Logos* was in the beginning—all things were made by him." John i. By the *Son*, the *Messiah*, "in whom we have redemption through his blood—who is the image of the invisible God—were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in the earth—and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col. i. "Thou *Lord* (El, God, in the Psalm civ, quoted as spoken of the Messiah) in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands." Heb. i. According to God's eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord, He created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." Eph. iii.

Now if any of these appellations distinctively designate the mediatorial Person, then it must be held that they all desig-

nate that Person; and if the acts of creation are ascribed to that Person in the character in which he appeared as the Messiah, then those acts are not intended to be ascribed to him simply as he is Divine—a Person of the Godhead—but to him as Mediator, as being mediatorial acts and part of his mediatorial work. If he was invested with his mediatorial office “before all things;” if “he created all things,” and if “by him all things consist,” are upheld and preserved, then it is to be believed that his mediatorial work comprised all external Divine acts in the sphere of finite existence. Hence, throughout the Old Test. he is represented as the great actor and revealer, the one manifested God, the God of providence; and in the New, as being by his original appointment, heir of all things, head over all, arbiter and judge of all, and as being in his incarnate Person, exalted to the throne of the universe, ruler over all, the first and the last. The universe is his work, his possession, his sphere of manifestation. In his relations to it he occupies the middle place between the Infinite Being and creatures. In his relations to creatures he acts mediatorially, not merely in a portion of the things which he made and upholds, but in all things, as God of providence, prophet, priest and king of his church, ruler and judge of his enemies.

This view of the universality of his mediatorial agency is illustrated in the announcements and interrogatories of the Jehovah when he appeared to Job, in “a whirlwind,” a form of appearance, doubtless, like that seen by Ezekiel, of which he says: “I looked, and behold, a whirlwind came out of the north, a great cloud, and a fire unfolding itself” &c. chap. i. “The Jehovah answered Job and said: Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Who hath prevented me, that I should repay him? Whatsoever is under the whole heaven is mine,” &c. &c. Job replied: “I know that thou canst do every thing, and that no thought can be withholden from thee. I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee.” chap. xxxviii–xlii. His universal providence is often asserted in the Scriptures, as in the cxlvii Psalm; and is often celebrated, as in the cxlviii Psalm, where all creatures in heaven and earth are called on to praise him: “Let them praise the name of the Jehovah; for he commanded, and they were created. He hath also established them forever.”

If it was in his official character that he created and upholds all things, then all external and visible works must be ascribed to him. If the name Jehovah signifies the second person, as legate of the Father, acting pursuant to the eternal covenant,

intermediately between the invisible Deity and creatures, executing the will of the Father and in this relation subordinate to him; if in this character he exercises mediatorial offices as prophet, priest, and king, redeeming his people, erecting a kingdom, vanquishing Satan, and administering the works of Providence in their relation to these ends, then must all the works ascribed to the Jehovah in the Old Test. be ascribed to him in this official capacity, and his acts under the ancient economy will be harmonious with those under the present. On the prevalent construction, the Divine acts of local and visible appearance, of familiar intercourse with man, of personal conversation with individuals and with good men, as Abraham, Jacob, Moses, giving them minute instructions as to their personal duties, their families, their temporal affairs; with bad men, like Cain, reasoning and remonstrating with them; and even with Satan on different occasions, imposing restraints on his evil agency; these and the like Divine acts may be believed as having actually taken place, but they surely cannot be conceived of as acts of the absolute Deity, nor as acts of the Father whom no man hath seen, and whose voice except as addressed expressly to the Messiah, no man hath ever heard, nor yet of the Son considered unofficially as coequal with the Father. Such acts imply sympathies, affections, relations, conditions, which are not to be predicated of the absolute unconditioned Deity, nor of the Father personally, as he is revealed in the New Test. or as he was personated or distinctively referred to in the Old. Can any one persuade himself that the malice and opposition of Satan was aimed directly against the absolute Deity, or against the Father as head of the Triality of Persons? Was it directly against Omnipotence that he waged his spiteful and persistent war? Did he, through his rival system of idolatry, provoke that infinite, and, to him, as to all other finite agents, incomprehensible Being, *to jealousy*? Did that Being institute (otherwise than through an official mediatorial constitution) a moral system, involving the necessity of his stooping to contend immediately with this arch rebel? Was it that Being whom the factors and servants of Satan, as Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, and others, openly defied? Was it that Being who, independently of all mediatory conditions and relations, led the children of Israel out of Egypt, administered a theocratic government as local chief magistrate, and directed and presided over the entire system of rites, worship, and bloody sacrifices at patriarchal altars, and in the Tabernacle and Temple? Is there, in respect to sinful man really and practically no difference, between the Divine Being as absolute and unconditioned,

and that Being as he has revealed himself a Unity and Trinity in and through one mediatorial and officially subordinate Person, standing midway between the Infinite and the finite, and qualified by covenant, official appointment, and personal engagement, to act reciprocally towards both?

We proceed on this view of his relations and offices, to shew that under the ancient economy patriarchs and prophets addressed their prayers directly to the Jehovah as the mediatorial Person, in the character in which he manifested himself locally and visibly, and was recognized as the revealer, and representative of the Father. So well was this character understood by them and so familiar were the tokens of his Deity and of his official agency, that his local and visible appearances seldom occasioned surprise to the beholders. They saw the visible form, sometimes like that of a plain way-faring man, sometimes as a warrior with a drawn sword; sometimes in a radiant cloudlike envelope; sometimes as seated on a throne, above the cherubim, in the effulgence of glory and majesty. They heard his voice and witnessed the exercise of his omniscience and his power.

This Divine Person appeared to Abraham in the similitude of a man, conversed and walked with him, disclosed to him his purpose of destroying Sodom, and heard his petitions. Gen. xviii. "Abraham stood before the Jehovah and said: Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked?—that be far from thee: Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? And the Jehovah said, If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then I will spare all the place for their sakes. And Abraham said, Oh let not the Jehovah be angry, and I will speak yet but this once: Peradventure ten shall be found there. And the Jehovah said, I will not destroy it for ten's sake. And the Jehovah went his way, as soon as he had left communing with Abraham: and Abraham returned unto his place." He thus addressed his petitions to the visible Person whom he saw, to whom he appealed as the Jehovah, the Judge of all the earth, and whose audible voice he heard in reply to his supplications. He evidently regarded that Divine Person as the ruler of the world, the administrator of providence, the revealer of the will of the invisible Father, the official mediatorial Person, to whom and through whom alone the prayers of men could be acceptably offered. He alludes to no other Mediator, or mediation. He accompanies his prayers by no sacrifices typical of the future manifestation of the Messiah; by no burning of incense; by no sacerdotal act; by no formula of faith other than that of his expressed and immediate faith

intermediately between the invisible Deity and creatures, executing the will of the Father and in this relation subordinate to him; if in this character he exercises mediatorial offices as prophet, priest, and king, redeeming his people, erecting a kingdom, vanquishing Satan, and administering the works of Providence in their relation to these ends, then must all the works ascribed to the 'Jehovah in the Old Test. be ascribed to him in this official capacity, and his acts under the ancient economy will be harmonious with those under the present. On the prevalent construction, the Divine acts of local and visible appearance, of familiar intercourse with man, of personal conversation with individuals and with good men, as Abraham, Jacob, Moses, giving them minute instructions as to their personal duties, their families, their temporal affairs; with bad men, like Cain, reasoning and remonstrating with them; and even with Satan on different occasions, imposing restraints on his evil agency; these and the like Divine acts may be believed as having actually taken place, but they surely cannot be conceived of as acts of the absolute Deity, nor as acts of the Father whom no man hath seen, and whose voice except as addressed expressly to the Messiah, no man hath ever heard, nor yet of the Son considered unofficially as coequal with the Father. Such acts imply sympathies, affections, relations, conditions, which are not to be predicated of the absolute unconditioned Deity, nor of the Father personally, as he is revealed in the New Test. or as he was personated or distinctively referred to in the Old. Can any one persuade himself that the malice and opposition of Satan was aimed directly against the absolute Deity, or against the Father as head of the Triality of Persons? Was it directly against Omnipotence that he waged his spiteful and persistent war? Did he, through his rival system of idolatry, provoke that infinite, and, to him, as to all other finite agents, incomprehensible Being, *to jealousy*? Did that Being institute (otherwise than through an official mediatorial constitution) a moral system, involving the necessity of his stooping to contend immediately with this arch rebel? Was it that Being whom the factors and servants of Satan, as Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, and others, openly defied? Was it that Being who, independently of all mediatory conditions and relations, led the children of Israel out of Egypt, administered a theocratic government as local chief magistrate, and directed and presided over the entire system of rites, worship, and bloody sacrifices at patriarchal altars, and in the Tabernacle and Temple? Is there, in respect to sinful man really and practically no difference, between the Divine Being as absolute and unconditioned,

and that Being as he has revealed himself a Unity and Trinity in and through one mediatorial and officially subordinate Person, standing midway between the Infinite and the finite, and qualified by covenant, official appointment, and personal engagement, to act reciprocally towards both?

We proceed on this view of his relations and offices, to shew that under the ancient economy patriarchs and prophets addressed their prayers directly to the Jehovah as the mediatorial Person, in the character in which he manifested himself locally and visibly, and was recognized as the revealer, and representative of the Father. So well was this character understood by them and so familiar were the tokens of his Deity and of his official agency, that his local and visible appearances seldom occasioned surprise to the beholders. They saw the visible form, sometimes like that of a plain way-faring man, sometimes as a warrior with a drawn sword; sometimes in a radiant cloudlike envelope; sometimes as seated on a throne, above the cherubim, in the effulgence of glory and majesty. They heard his voice and witnessed the exercise of his omniscience and his power.

This Divine Person appeared to Abraham in the similitude of a man, conversed and walked with him, disclosed to him his purpose of destroying Sodom, and heard his petitions. Gen. xviii. "Abraham stood before the Jehovah and said: Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked?—that be far from thee: Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? And the Jehovah said, If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then I will spare all the place for their sakes. And Abraham said, Oh let not the Jehovah be angry, and I will speak yet but this once: Peradventure ten shall be found there. And the Jehovah said, I will not destroy it for ten's sake. And the Jehovah went his way, as soon as he had left communing with Abraham: and Abraham returned unto his place." He thus addressed his petitions to the visible Person whom he saw, to whom he appealed as the Jehovah, the Judge of all the earth, and whose audible voice he heard in reply to his supplications. He evidently regarded that Divine Person as the ruler of the world, the administrator of providence, the revealer of the will of the invisible Father, the official mediatorial Person, to whom and through whom alone the prayers of men could be acceptably offered. He alludes to no other Mediator, or mediation. He accompanies his prayers by no sacrifices typical of the future manifestation of the Messiah; by no burning of incense; by no sacerdotal act; by no formula of faith other than that of his expressed and immediate faith

in that Person whom he knew as God, the revealed God, his covenant God.

Now to suppose the Jehovah to whom he has addressed his prayers, to have been the absolute Deity without distinction of Persons, or to have been the Father,—the first Person, in distinction from the Second as his legate, is to exclude the idea of any Mediator in the case, to whom and on the ground of whose merits, intercession and official relations, his prayers were offered and accepted. There is no escape from this conclusion. Either Abraham saw and conversed with the Absolute Deity, or he saw and conversed with the Father personally, and offered his prayers directly to him without reference to a Mediator; or he saw and conversed with the official mediatorial Person; the Mediator himself who represented and officially personated the Father, so that "what he did, the Father also did"—as being one in nature and will, dwelling in each other and acting coincidentally, as explained by the Jehovah incarnate as Messiah: John v: 17-38.—vi: 38-51.—viii: 26-58.—x: 19-37.—xiv: 6-20, &c. And if these prayers were addressed directly to the acting mediatorial Person, then it is just and safe to infer that all his prayers, earlier and later, were in like manner addressed to that Person; for in no instance do they refer to any other Mediator. The Jehovah "appeared" to him at different times and places. At various places where he temporarily sojourned, "he built an altar to the Jehovah who appeared unto him, and called on the name of the Jehovah."

With this agrees the testimony of the New Test. concerning him. The incarnate Jehovah himself declares in a controversy John viii concerning himself as a person: "Before Abraham was, I am", i. e. I, the person whom you reject, then existed; and by one of his apostles that Abraham believed *God* and his faith was accounted to him for righteousness; that they which are of FAITH the same are the children of Abraham, and are blessed with faithful Abraham; that the faith through which he was justified was identical with that through which Christian believers, Jewish and Gentile, are justified; that his faith in the Jehovah whom he saw, was the same as to its object and to its efficacy, as that of the Gentiles who believed in the Christ. Even in their burnt-offerings and sacrifices the ancients, so far from considering them as supplying the place or having the effect of mediation did but express in that way, their faith and their prayers by visible acts. Those offerings were made directly to the Jehovah, on altars dedicated to him. Generally and probably without exception, they were accompanied by a vocal utterance of petitions. "Abram built an

altar unto the Jehovah, and called upon the name of Jehovah." Gen. xii. "The Jehovah appeared unto Isaac, and he builded an altar and called upon the name of the Jehovah." Gen. xvi. When the continual burnt-offering morning and evening was prescribed, it was required to be presented "at the door of the tabernacle, before the Jehovah; where I will meet you, to speak there unto thee. And there I will meet with the children of Israel, and I will sanctify the tabernacle and the altar." Exod. xxix. When Elijah repaired the altar of the Jehovah at Mount Carmel and offered a burnt-sacrifice, he prayed and said, O Jehovah Elohe of Abraham, Isaac and of Israel, let it be known this day that thou art Elohim in Israel", &c. 2 K. xviii. Closely connected with the continual burnt-sacrifice, was the burning of *incense*, in the Levitical service, symbolizing the prayers offered in connection with the burnt sacrifices. Thus Zacharias, officiating in the Temple, burnt incense. "And the whole multitude of the people were praying without, at the time of incense." Luke i. In the Apocalypse this symbol recurs as appearing in the heavenly sanctuary. An angel, having a golden censer, received much incense "that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne." Rev. viii. It is thus evident that the sacrifices were not, any more than the prayers, regarded as having any mediative character or relation. The efficacy of the prayers depended on actual mediation. The sacrifices expressed the faith of the worshipper in outward and visible actions.

A reference to particular portions of the history, to those portions, for example, which narrate the lives of the respective Patriarchs, will show that, where the name Elohim is almost exclusively employed, the name Jehovah when occasionally interposed is connected with some act or event more or less indicative of his mediatorial agency. Thus, in the history of Jacob, the names El, Elohe, Elohim occur more than sixty times, and the name Jehovah less than a fourth part of that number. But the name Jehovah occurs in such connections as the following: In Jacob's vision of a ladder whose top reached to heaven, "Behold the Jehovah stood above it, and said, I am the Jehovah, Elohe of Abraham,—and Jacob said, Surely the Jehovah is in this place—this is none other but the house of Elohim—and he called the name of that place Beth-El." Gen. xxviii. In chap. xxxi: "The Jehovah said unto Jacob, Return unto the land of thy fathers:" and "Maleach the Elohim said unto him, I am the El of Beth-El—return unto the land of thy kindred." chap. xxxii, 9. In his prayer for

deliverance from Esau, "Jacob said, O, Elohe of my father Abraham—the Jehovah which saidst unto me, Return unto thy country, and to thy kindred.—Deliver me I pray thee." And, v. 24, "Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled *a man* with him, and he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel [*prevailer with God*], for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed. And Jacob said, I have seen Elohim face to face." Hosea, chap. xii, referring to this narrative says: "He had power with Elohim; yea he had power over the Maleach and prevailed: he wept and made supplication *unto him*: he found him in Beth-El, even the Jehovah Elohe of Hosts; the [Name] Jehovah is his memorial".

To the same effect, as in the cases of Abraham and Jacob, is the scripture record concerning Moses. The Jehovah, in the official character and the visible form of manifestation of the image, representative, messenger (angel) of the invisible Father, appeared to Moses in a shekina of flame in a bush, and spoke to him as *the Jehovah, the Elohim, the Elohe of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob*. It is to be observed that throughout the writings of Moses, as in those of David and the Prophets, these and the other Divine appellations, Jah, El, Adonai are employed interchangeably, to designate the same Divine Person, not only in the same connection and with reference to the same acts and events, but often in the same sentences. In the present instance "*the angel or messenger Jehovah appeared unto Moses*" in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush; Moses turned to observe the appearance; the *Jehovah* saw that he turned aside to see—the *Elohim* called unto him out of the midst of the bush—and he said, I am the *Elohe* of Abraham, the *Elohe* of Isaac, and the *Elohe* of Jacob. And Moses hid his face for he was afraid to look upon *The Elohim*. And the *Jehovah* said I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and I am come down to deliver them, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people. And Moses said unto *the Elohim*, Who am I that I should go unto Pharaoh. And *Elohim* said unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you—the *Jehovah Elohim* of your fathers, the *Elohe* of Abraham, &c. hath sent me unto you." Exod. iii, 6-16. It is plain that the *Messenger* who "came down to deliver his people," and was locally present and spoke from the midst of the bush, was personally one and the same with the *Jehovah, the Elohim, the Elohe of Abraham, the God of the patriarchal dispensation*. Under these

designations he continued to converse with Moses, and to instruct and direct him, throughout the subsequent narrative. To him, Moses and Aaron addressed their petitions for the removal of some of the plagues in Egypt. To him, as the Jehovah announced by Moses, Pharaoh repeatedly asked them to pray. He instituted the Passover, and at midnight *went out through Egypt* and smote the first born. When he conducted the children of Israel out of Egypt, "*the Jehovah went before them* by day in a pillar of a cloud to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire." Exod. xiii, 21—thus identifying himself with the Jehovah in the bush. When about to pass the Red Sea, "*the Messenger, the Elohim, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them* ; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them : and it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel—and *the Jehovah looked* unto the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled them," &c. Exod. xiv : 19-23.

In the song of Moses "*the Jehovah,*" as if recognized in the visible similitude of *Man*, is denominated "*a man of war* : Thou stretchedst out thy right hand—the earth swallowed them. Thou in thy mercy hast led forth the people which thou hast redeemed—Thou shalt bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of their inheritance, in the place O Jehovah ! which thou hast made for thee to dwell in, in the Sanctuary O Jehovah ! which thy hands have established. The Jehovah shall reign forever and ever." Exod. xv. In this passage he is identified with the Jehovah who dwelt in the tabernacle and temple.

Passing by the visible appearance of the Jehovah to Moses and to the elders on Mount Sinai, to Moses at the door of the Tabernacle and on various occasions, his appearance to Balaam, and many other evidences in the Pentateuch, that the MESSENGER—the Jehovah, the Elohim—the God of the preceding and of the Levitical dispensations, was one and the same delegated, mediatorial Person, we refer briefly to some instances after the death of Moses, in which he appeared locally and visibly. To Joshua he appeared as "*a man, with his drawn sword in his hand*" ; and directed him how to conduct the siege of Jericho. "*And the Jehovah said unto Joshua, See, I have given into thy hand Jericho*" Josh. vi. Subsequently he directed Joshua in every emergency ; and to the Jehovah, directly, Joshua addressed his prayers. After the death of Joshua, the tribes of Israel failed to extirpate Idolatry, "*and the Messenger Jehovah came up from Gilgal [the place of the tabernacle] to Bochim,*

and said, I made you to go up out of Egypt" &c. The context shows that the children of Israel to whom he spoke, recognized him as *the Jehovah*, the God of Israel; "and they sacrificed there unto the Jehovah". Judges ii. At a later period Judges vi. (compared with chap. ii.), the identity of *the Messenger with the Jehovah* is manifested. "And it came to pass, when the children of Israel cried unto the Jehovah because of the Midianites, that the Jehovah sent a prophet unto the children of Israel, which said unto them, Thus saith the Jehovah, the Elohe of Israel, *I brought you up out of Egypt*, &c.—and the Messenger, Jehovah, came and sat under an oak"—where Gideon was—"and the Messenger, Jehovah, appeared unto him and said unto him, The Jehovah is with thee." A colloquy ensues between the Jehovah and Gideon. Gideon prepares an offering. "The Messenger, *the Elohim*" directs him how to present it. "Then the Messenger, Jehovah, put forth the end of the staff that was in his hand, and touched the flesh and the unleavened cakes: and there rose up fire out of the rock and consumed the flesh and the unleavened cakes. Then the Messenger Jehovah, departed out of his sight. And when Gideon perceived that he was the Messenger, the Jehovah, he said, Alas, O my Adon Jehovah! for because I have seen the Messenger Jehovah, face to face. And the Jehovah said unto him, Peace be unto thee! Then Gideon built an altar unto the Jehovah." In chapter 2d the Messenger having come up from Gilgal, affirms of himself the same personal agency, which in chap. vi. the Jehovah God of Israel affirms of himself.

To Manoah and his wife the Messenger, Jehovah, appeared repeatedly in the form of a Man. He is called "a man *the Elohim*," and his countenance is said to be like that of the "Messenger *the Elohim*." Manoah prayed to the *Jehovah*, that the Man *the Elohim*, might come again; "and *the Eloheim* hearkened to the voice of Manoah; and the Messenger *the Elohim* came again"—Manoah presented an offering "unto the Jehovah,"—the Person visibly present; and "when the flame went up toward heaven from the altar, the Messenger *Jehovah*, ascended in the flame of the altar." Manoah knew that he was the Messenger *Jehovah* and said, "We shall surely die, because we have seen *Elohim*." His wife replied, "If the Jehovah were pleased to kill us, he would not have received a burnt offering and a meat offering at our hands, neither would he have showed us all these things". Judges xiii. Here the visible appearance of a Person in the form of Man; the application to him of his name of office in-

terchangeably with the Divine names: the recognition of him in his true character, by Manoah; the occurrence of the *article* before the word Elohim; and the structure and purport of the narrative, preclude all doubt as to the identity of the Person, and therefore all doubt as to his being the one only Mediatorial Person, and as to his then acting mediatorially. For if the Maleach—(angel or messenger)—who appeared locally or visibly was a Divine Person, and according to his name of office was “sent”,—a Divine Messenger,—then he was the one Mediatorial Person, for but one such Divine Person was ever “sent” to the world to represent and do the will of the Father. And if that Person was designated and identified by the name Jehovah as certainly as by the title Maleach, then the Jehovah (the Elohim, &c.) was the Mediatorial Person.

No reason can be assigned why the Divine names, Jah, Jehovah, El, Elohim, Adonai, throughout the Old Test. are, as designations, employed interchangeably, but that they were understood to be equivalent designations of one and the same Person. It may well be supposed, however, that the reason why the official title Maleach, though as a designation employed interchangeably with the Divine names, was employed only occasionally, was, that the application of it marked a local and visible appearance of the delegated Mediatorial Person,—the Jehovah, unveiling himself in the simple and irradiant, or in the glorified form of the nature he was to assume and take into permanent union with his Person. Doubtless the association of the human form, human attributes, faculties, affections, sympathies, actions, with the Mediatorial Person thus appearing locally and visibly, realized him to be objectively to the faith of the ancient church, just what he is, since the incarnation to Gentile believers.

The Hebrew word Maleach, which in our version is translated *Angel*, as if it were the name of an angelic creature, is properly but a name of office, signifying a messenger. It is translated messenger, whenever men are the subjects: but whenever the Divine messenger is referred to, it is generally rendered, *angel*. When with this reference it occurs alone, it has the *article*, as Gen. xlviii: 15, 16. “And Jacob said, *The* Elohim, before whom my fathers, Abraham and Isaac did walk, *the* Elohim which fed me all my life long unto this day, *the* Maleach, which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.” Sometimes, says Gesenius (art. Maleach) the same Divine appearance, which at one time is called Mal-ach, Jehovah, is afterwards called simply Jehovah, as Gen. xvi: 7 and

in numerous other places. This, he adds, "is to be so understood, that the *Angel of God* is here nothing else than the invisible deity itself, which thus unveils itself to mortal eyes." After referring to authorities, he says: "Hence oriental translators, wherever Jehovah himself is said to appear on earth, always put for the name of God *the angel of God*." The phrase "invisible deity itself, which thus unveils itself," appears to have no reference to Divine *Person*, as appearing; and apparently the orientals meant by *the angel of God*, not a Divine Person, but merely an extraordinary impersonal appearance, or at most, a created angelic agent. Had they believed that the Jehovah himself personally appeared on earth, that he was locally present and visible as a Person in the likeness of a Man—(as afterwards literally in man's nature)—that he conversed with patriarchs, and others, gave them evidences of his omniscience and omnipotence, and was recognized by them as a Person, the revealer, representative, messenger of the Father, they would have seen no occasion for suppressing his name and substituting a formula which, as a personal designation, indicates and implies only creature attributes.

When the Israelites, under the kings who succeeded David, rejected the faith of the ancient church concerning the Jehovah and the Messiah, and turned their backs upon him as the object of their worship and obedience, and joined themselves to idols, they ceased, as far as possible to pronounce, write, or otherwise to recognize and keep his name in remembrance. For their apostacy they were subjected to captivity to idolatrous masters; their temple was destroyed, and their worship discontinued; they had forsaken the Jehovah, and he executed upon them the judgments which he had threatened. They seem, the "Remnant" of true spiritual worshippers according to the primitive faith always excepted,—to have relapsed into practical *Theism*: and when they renounced idolatry to have renounced the doctrine and all the theories and forms of mediation. Thenceforth the Messiah whom they expected, was to-be a merely temporal prince. For the teachings of Moses and the Prophets they substituted traditions and glosses by which they made void the law, and perverted or explained away the primitive doctrines and faith, the distinction of Persons in the Godhead, the incarnation and divinity of the Messiah, salvation by his atonement, his mission to the Gentiles and the spirituality of his kingdom. It was in keeping with all this to represent the *Maleach*, who appeared visibly, and under the names Jehovah and Elohim performed Divine acts, was wor-

shipped by sacrifices and prayers, and exercised mediatorial offices, as one of the class of created beings called angels, who from time to time were sent on special errands to the earth. This view being adopted and followed by the *Seventy* and other early translators, was followed by the authors of the more modern versions, including our own; and the Hebrew text construed accordingly. Hence Maleach is rendered *angel*; Maleach Jehovah, *an or the* angel of the Lord; Maleach *the* Elohim, an angel of God,—the construction being governed by the supposed nature and character of the Maleach. Had the translators perceived that the word Maleach designated the same Divine Person as the words Jehovah and Elohim, they would no more have construed the word Jehovah, as the genitive of the word Maleach, than they would have construed the word Elohim when preceded by the word Jehovah as the genitive of the latter. It is indubitable that the words Maleach, Jehovah, and Elohim, are employed interchangeably to designate the same Divine Person; and there is nothing in the original text to forbid the first two equally with the last two of these words being construed as in apposition.

On this view the subject is relieved of difficulty. And as to the early manifestations themselves of the Jehovah, in that visible form in which he was afterwards, in the progress of his official work, to appear visibly incarnate on earth; they can hardly be thought more remarkable than that he should, while sojourning on earth as man, assume, in the presence of his apostles on the Mount, that glorified form of manifestation which was to succeed his resurrection. "He was transfigured before them: His face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light." In this form of ineffable glory, he appeared to Saul, when near Damascus; and to John in Patmos. And indeed he assumed essentially this form in some of his appearances under the Old Test. I saw, says Isaiah, the Adonai sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphims—and they cried one unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Jehovah of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory. Then said I, Woe is me, for mine eyes have seen the King, the Jehovah of hosts; also I heard the voice of the Jehovah." Isa. vi. John referring to this scene, says it was the glory of Christ which Isaiah saw. Chap. xii. In Ezekiel's vision of the glorified appearance of the Jehovah, with its cherubic and dazzling accompaniments, there was, above the firmament, "the likeness of a throne, and upon the throne, the likeness as the appearance

of a *Man* above upon it. And I saw as the color of amber, as the appearance of fire round about within it, from the appearance of his loins even upward, and from the appearance of his loins even downward, I saw as it were the appearance of fire. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Jehovah. And when I saw it, I fell upon my face, and I heard a voice of one that spake. And he said unto me, Son of man, I send thee unto the children of Israel." Ezek. i : 2. This vision was repeated afterwards, the scene being changed to the temple at Jerusalem. "And behold the glory of the God of Israel was there according to the vision that I saw in the plain." After he had instructed the prophet concerning the impending destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple, and the reason for it, the God of Israel forsook and withdrew from the temple. "The glory of the Jehovah went up from the midst of the city, and stood upon the mountain which is on the east side of the city"—that is Mount Olivet. In a vision subsequently, of the restoration of the temple and of his return to it, it is said, chap. xliii, "The glory of the God of Israel, came from the way of the east: and his voice was like a noise of many waters: and the earth shined with his glory. And it was according to the appearance of the vision which I saw—by the river Chebar; and I fell upon my face. And the glory of the Jehovah came into the house—and the glory of the Jehovah filled the house. And I heard him speaking unto me out of the house".

The vision of Daniel chap vii. resembles in the description of particulars, the instances already mentioned. Also the descent of the Jehovah in fire on Mount Sinai. Exod. xix. In the earlier ages it is not unlikely that such appearances were frequent. An impression was current at an early period, that those would not survive who saw God in a manner so visibly indicating his Divine perfections; an impression derived, probably, from the fact that the beholders were so impressed as to fall on their faces, and sometimes to become insensible. These glorious appearances were of various degrees of brightness. They were not always local and restricted to the view of a single beholder, or to that of a few individuals. Sometimes the manifestation illumined the whole hemisphere. Habbakuk says: "God came from Teman, and the Holy One from Mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise, and his brightness was as the light".

Similar allusions occur in the Psalms, both retrospective and prophetic, implying that to the apprehension and faith of the

ancient church, the manifestations of the Jehovah in ineffable glory as God of Providence and as King and Redeemer of his people and future conqueror of all enemies, were familiar as themes of exultation and praise.

"O Elohim, when thou wentest forth before thy people,
 "When thou didst march through the wilderness; selah:
 "The earth shook, the heavens also dropped
 "At the PRESENCE of the Elohim:
 "Even Sinai itself was moved
 "At the PRESENCE of the Elohim, the Elohe of Israel.

"The chariots of the Elohim are twenty thousand,
 "Even thousands of angels:
 "The Adonai is among them,
 "As in Sinai, IN THE HOLY PLACE
 "Thou hast ascended on high,
 "Thou hast led captivity captive:
 "Thou hast received gifts for men:
 "Yea for the rebellious also,
 "That the Jah Elohim might dwell among them. Ps. lxxviii.
 See also Ps. xviii : 8, 9.

In the New Testament, Math. xxiv : 27, the future visible appearance and coming of the Jehovah in his glorified humanity, is compared to the brightness of lightning. "And when he shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." "Behold he cometh with clouds and every eye shall see him."

It is in harmony with these facts that at the Incarnation, and in the transition from Judaism to Christianity, holy men addressed their prayers directly to the same Divine Person, the Jehovah then manifested in human nature, the Messiah, the Jehovah incarnate. A voice had warned them "to prepare the way of *the Jehovah*—a highway for our *God*". The glory of the Jehovah was to be revealed; the God of the former dispensation was to appear in Emmanuel. Isa. xl, &c. It was revealed to Simeon that he should not die before he had seen the Messiah, the Jehovah incarnate. An angel announced the Saviour as "*Christ the Lord*"—Messiah *the Jehovah*. Luke ii : 11. Thenceforth he is addressed by prayer and otherwise as the Jehovah, (the Lord), Jesus, the Christ; Jesus the Christ our Jehovah. Rom. iii : 11, 14.

The doctrine so evidently taught in the Scriptures, that the Jehovah acted Mediatorially under the ancient economy, that those who were justified were justified by faith in him as the one Mediator, and that their prayers were addressed to him in

that character, is in keeping with every aspect and relation of the redemptive work. The church is one under all dispensations, saved in one way through faith in the Mediator. In him all who have been, and all who are to be, saved, were chosen before the foundation of the world. There is one body or church,—one Spirit, one Jehovah, one Father, one faith. Ep. iv : 4-6. Therefore the Jehovah, in whom Abraham believed and likewise all who were justified before the Advent, was the mediatorial Person; for no other is referred to in connection with his or with their faith. And those who anciently believed in him unto righteousness, must have had essentially the same apprehensions of him as a Person, and as to his offices, and the same affections towards him as those who saw him incarnate and as their successors to the present time.

Accordingly when, after the Ascension, the apostles preached the Gospel to the Jews, it was their chief endeavor to convince their hearers, that the Jehovah of the ancient Scriptures had become incarnate and was the Messiah whom they had crucified and slain, and that their relation to the incarnate Mediator was the same with that of their ancestors to the Jehovah. Hence they addressed him indifferently under the Greek appellative which replaced the name Jehovah, and the titles which belonged to him as the Messiah. Just prior to the Ascension they ask him, Acts i : 6 : "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?"—addressing the risen Messiah as identical with the Jehovah of the prior dispensation, the Theocratic Head of the kingdom of Israel. Wilt Thou who didst institute and rule the kingdom, now restore it and resume thy regal office? His reply signifies, that as the Legate of the Father, the revealer and executor of his will, he disclosed things future only, as he was directed. At the close of Peter's argument, Acts ii, he says : "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God [the Father] hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ"—the Jehovah and the Messiah : hath appointed, constituted him, to be the Mediator, as the Jehovah under the Old Test. and the Messiah, the Jehovah incarnate, under the New. On the occasion referred to, Acts iv, when the apostles had escaped the hands of persecutors, they came to their own company, who, on hearing what had happened, exultingly "lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, *Lord*, Thou art God, which hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is,"—meaning the same as if it had been said, that they lifted up their voice spontaneously to the mediatorial Person, the Logos who was God and made all things; the Je-

hovah who created the heavens and the earth; the same Person now manifested incarnate. To him directly, they addressed their prayer, v. 29, "And now Lord, behold their threatening". So Stephen prayed directly to the Jehovah incarnate as Mediator, when he said, Acts vii: 54-60, "LORD Jesus receive my spirit: LORD lay not this sin to their charge". And Saul, Acts ix: 15: "Who art thou LORD?" "LORD what wilt thou have me to do?" Ananias says, ix: 17: "The LORD, even Jesus, that appeared to thee". And, Acts ix: 27: Barnabas declared how Saul "had seen THE LORD in the way, and had preached, at Damascus, in the name of Jesus", and, v. 29, "in the name of the LORD Jesus".

The Greek word *Kurios*, translated *Lord*, in the New Test. is the equivalent of the Hebrew word *Jehovah*, rendered Lord in the Old. So also in the Septuagint. This identifies the Jehovah of the one with the Jehovah incarnate of the other, in the Person of the Messiah. John the Baptist was sent to prepare the way for the appearance of *the Jehovah* in man's nature. When he appeared, it was essential first to show and certify that he was the Jehovah incarnate. To work this conviction he, while exercising Divine attributes, called himself *the Son of man*—thereby attesting that the Divine and human natures were united in his Person. The apostles denominated the complex Person, the Jehovah, the Son of God, the Christ, the Saviour—as equivalent designations of the one mediatorial Person. Faith in that Person was essential to salvation, and as truly so under the Jewish as under the Christian dispensation. Accordingly the Jehovah says, Isaiah xlv: 22-25. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. Unto ME every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely shall one say, in *the Jehovah* have I righteousness and strength: even to *him* shall men come. In *the Jehovah* shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory".

Acts xiii: 47: "For so hath the LORD commanded us—(saying—) I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles". *The Lord*, the Person whom they customarily designated by that name, who chose them to be apostles, and commanded them what to do; viz The Jehovah now incarnate—the Jehovah of the Old Test. as Mediator who, prospectively, spoke to and of himself as the Messiah, saying Isaiah xlix: "It is a light thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob. I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles"—and xv: 16. "After this I [the Jehovah] will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David—that, (v 17,) the residue

of men might seek after *the Lord*—*the Jehovah*. See also Amos ix : 12.

Among the examples in the Old Testament of the express identification of the Jehovah of the ancient dispensations with the Messiah of the present, the 24th Psalm is referred to. Bishop Horsley, from whose version we quote, after noticing the purport of the first six verses, observes that “the song concludes with a prediction of the exaltation of the Messiah (for he is certainly the Jehovah of this Psalm) under the image of an entry of Jehovah into his temple”. The Psalm opens with a chorus ascribing to the Jehovah the creation and proprietorship of the earth with its inhabitants, and all its furniture. Next, in questions and answers, sung by different voices, it describes the conditions and way of justification. Then follows the conclusion above referred to. If we conceive of the whole as being performed by choruses in the temple, at the time of the burnt offering, it proclaims the triumphant entrance of the Messiah—the incarnate Jehovah,—into the heavenly sanctuary after accomplishing his typified work of expiation. The Jehovah then present in his mediatory office in the sanctuary within the veil, is, in connection with the types of his future incarnation and vicarious work, represented as triumphant, the King of Glory, claiming admission into his tabernacle in heaven. The scene must have been most impressive, and instructive. The slaughtered lamb as a whole burnt offering vividly prefigured the atoning sacrifice of the Messiah. What should follow but that, leading captivity captive, he who had descended should also ascend “up far above all heavens that he might fill all things”? “The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels : the Lord is among them as in Sinai in the holy place. Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive : Thou hast received gifts for men”. Ps. lxxviii : 17. From the 24th Ps. we quote the last four verses :

Semichorus. “O ye gates lift up your heads,
“And be ye lifted up ye everlasting doors,
“And let the King of Glory enter.

A single voice. “Who is He, this King of Glory ?

Another voice. “Jehovah Strong and Mighty,
“Jehovah mighty in battle.

Semichorus. “O ye gates lift up your heads,
“And be ye lifted up ye everlasting doors,
“And let the King of Glory enter.

A single voice. “Who is He, this King of Glory ?

Grand chorus. “Jehovah of Hosts, He is the King of Glory.

“Jehovah of Hosts, i. e. He who is the principle and founda-

tion of existence to the whole assemblage of created being". *Horsley*. The Messiah whose vicarious work was typified in the tabernacle "made with hands" and who entered "the true tabernacle" in heaven, was personally and officially identical with the Jehovah of Hosts, the King of Glory, the Creator and upholder of all things.

This view of the mediatorial agency of the Jehovah throughout the ancient dispensations, is assumed and implied in the New Testament records; not only by evidences like those adduced, but by the teachings of the Messiah himself, to the effect that the Father, as a Person, had not before,—(otherwise than as anciently personated and represented by the mediating Jehovah),—been distinctively announced; that it was by the Mediator that the Father was expressly declared: that previously the prayers of holy men were not addressed to the Father in the name of the acting mediator, but directly to the Mediator himself as the image, legate and representative of the father. Now, he having taught his apostles concerning the Father and his relations to him, there was to be a change. "O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee: but *I have known thee*, and these have known that *thou hast sent me*. And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it." "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full. Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you. These things have I spoken to you in proverbs [figures]: but the time cometh when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall show you plainly of the Father. At that day ye shall ask in my name: and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you: [that, you, asking in my name will expect of course]—For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God. I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world and go to the Father." John xvi: 17.

That the Christian writers immediately succeeding the Apostolic age taught, that the Jehovah of the Old Test. was a Divine Person distinct from God the Father, and that the Messiah who had appeared was personally and officially the same who was called Jehovah, Elohim, etc., is evident from what remains of their treatises. Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho, cites, in proof of this doctrine, passages from Psalms xxiv, lv, lvii, lxxviii, xcix, and others, and from the narrative of his visible appearances, to Abraham before the destruction of Sodom, and to Jacob as "the messenger

and Jehovah", in his vision of the ladder, and at Luz. His 59th Section is entitled: "The God that talked with Moses was a Person distinct from God the Father." After stating that "this very Angel, and God, and Lord, which appeared as a Man to Abraham and Jacob, appeared to Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush, and talked with him", —he quotes from Exod. iii : 16, the declaration of the angel or messenger, that he was the Lord God, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, and adds, "This Person, whom Moses calls the angel that talked with him is God, and declares to Moses that he is the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob". *Theophilus*, in a note extracted, by the translator, from Bishop Bull, observes: "'God the Almighty Father of all cannot be in place, nor is he ever found there: for there is no determinate place of his rest.' The primitive Fathers referred all those appearances of God, which were formerly exhibited to the patriarchs, to the economy of man's salvation; which economy they supposed that the Son of God did not then first take upon him when he made his appearance in the flesh, but from the fall of our first parent: but they were fully persuaded that this economy could not possibly be performed by the Person of God the Father. Because for the very same reason as the Catholic church of Christ always acknowledged, in opposition to the Patripassians, that God the Father could not be incarnate as the Son was, did the ancients affirm that these appearances were not made by the Father, but by the Son, as being really preludes to his incarnation." —*Bull.*

The work which, anterior to the creation the mediatorial Person undertook and covenanted to execute, comprised all that he was to do in the sphere of finite relations and events. It was one work; and though gradually advanced in its execution from stage to stage, the execution of a part secured and gave effect to every part, and to the whole. The work of creation regarded in its relation to him, necessarily preceded the work of atonement; but both being parts of the entire Mediatorial work, the accomplishment of the first involved and rendered as legally and immediately available the results of the second, as if the atoning Sacrifice had been slain from the foundation of the world. Were this otherwise it would be so for reasons which would preclude the gift of pardon and justification on the ground of the atonement till all ulterior mediatorial works, a perpetual intercession and a final sentence of acquittal and glorification, were realized.

From the above considerations, and from the whole current

of scriptural doctrine, the analogy of faith, the oneness of the Church, the reality of justification as an act of God coincidentally with the exercise of faith by the sinner, and the results of this process in multitudes under the ancient economy who were justified, and who died in the faith in full anticipation of the events then predicted and typified, and which have been or are to be realized under the present and future dispensations, we conclude that there was an acting Mediator, and actual Mediation under the ancient economy; and that the Jehovah who administered that economy acted Mediatorially under that and other names and titles, and at length as a Person, and in pursuance of his official work, became literally incarnate for the suffering of death, and destruction of the works of Satan. That those ancient believers understood the system in this light might be argued from particular facts; from the early institution of the typical sacrifices; from the translation of Enoch and Elijah; from the prophecy of Enoch as rehearsed by Jude: "Behold the Jehovah cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment", etc.; from the miracles wrought by the Jehovah and in his name under the old dispensations; from the typical import of the judgments which he inflicted, as in the instance of Sodom and Gomorrah; from the names and designations employed in predictions of the Messiah; from the appearance and the purport of the message of Moses and Elias at the transfiguration; and from the resurrection of many of the Old Test. saints after that of the Messiah. These and the like facts argue the sameness of the ancient with the present system, and of the way of justification and acceptance through an acting Mediator. On the other hand it may be alleged as an historical fact, that of those who like Cain rejected the revealed system, and embraced idolatry or some other false system, no one was ever justified. Their prayers and acts of homage were not offered through the Mediator, and therefore were not accepted. Their *natural religion* did not avail them.

The same conclusions might be confirmed by an examination of the terms employed as Divine names, titles, and designations, in the Old and New Testaments; the connections in which they occur, the appropriation of them interchangeably, their manifest reference and significance in particular instances, the obscurity and confusion occasioned by translating or substituting for them the secular and idolatrous nomenclature of heathens, instead of transferring those of the original text into our version of the Scriptures. But our limits restrain us from further discussion.

ART. VI.—COLENSO ON THE PENTATEUCH. PART II.

By DANIEL R. GOODWIN, D.D., Provost of the University of Pennsylvania.

THE PENTATEUCH AND THE BOOK OF JOSHUA CRITICALLY EXAMINED. By the Rt. Rev. JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D.D., Bishop of Natal. Part II. Appleton. New-York, 1863. Pp. 303.

IN the last number of this REVIEW we ventured to predict that if Bishop Colenso's Part I should fall, his Part II must fall with it. A more critical examination of his second part has confirmed the anticipation. He himself admits as much. He all along assumes the results of his Part I as the necessary and sufficient basis for the argumentation of his Part II. Thus he says: "No reliance whatever can be placed on the *details* of the story of the exodus. It will be found that *they are inextricably bound up with the numbers*" (p. 14). "Our previous considerations have forced upon us the conviction, by reason of the impossibilities contained in it, that the account of the exodus, *generally*, is wanting in historical truth, and that, consequently, it cannot be assumed beforehand as certain, without a careful examination of each part of the narrative, that any of such 'groups of laws' as the story describes were laid down in the wilderness. The result of our inquiries, as far as we have proceeded, is that such a narrative as that which is contained in the Pentateuch, could not have been written in the age of Moses; or for some time afterwards (175)". (p. 71.) After stating certain "signs of later date in the Pentateuch", he adds: "But these difficulties, after all, are by us regarded as only of secondary importance. They are not those on which we rest the *stress* of our argument. Being satisfied, on other sure grounds, as set forth in Part I, that the story in the Pentateuch has no claim to be regarded as historically true, etc". (p. 92.) "Hitherto we have been advancing upon *certain* ground. It seems to follow as a necessary conclusion from the facts which we have already had before us in Part I, that the account of the Exodus is in very essential parts not historically true. But we are now entering upon the field of conjecture" (p. 119.) "The above is said",—referring to the argument from

the composition of names in the Pentateuch,—“assuming that it has already been sufficiently shown that there is no reason to suppose that the details of the story of the Exodus, including the lists of names, etc., are historically true. Otherwise, it might, of course, be argued that the very fact that no such Jehovistic names occur in the whole narrative is itself a strong indication of the truthfulness and historical reality of the record” (p. 129). At present, the suggestions which we have made above are only conjectural, except to this extent that (i.) we have seen reason already to conclude with certainty”, —referring to a section which itself refers to Part I,—“that the main portion, at least, of the story of the Exodus must have been written long after the time of Moses and Joshua”.

Thus it will be seen that his Part II is confessedly based upon Part I, and will not pretend to stand without it. Indeed he has felt obliged, in the first chapter of Part II, to review, reinforce, and defend some of the main positions of Part I, particularly that in regard to the “numbers”. He makes, however, but one new point which seems to us to require attention; and that is in a note. “The *whole number* of male Kohathites, as given in Num. iii, 8,600, is more than *one fourth as large again* as that of the Merarites, 6,200; whereas the converse is the case with the *adults*, since the number of Merarite males *from thirty to fifty years old*, 3,200, is just *one sixth as large again* as that of the Kohathites, 2,750. Besides this palpable inconsistency, the Merarite males ‘from thirty to fifty’ are more than half the whole number of males of that family, ‘from a month old and upward’, contrary to all the data of modern statistical science”. In reply to this, we have only to suggest the possibility that, by some accident in transcribing, either the Kohathites and Merarites, or the numbers corresponding to them respectively, have been *interchanged*, in one passage or in the other. In any event, therefore, this is not sufficient ground for declaring the Pentateuch unhistorical.

We shall take this opportunity to complete and confirm our own statements in regard to the numbers of the Israelites at the time of the exodus. We take for granted that, if it can be shown to be neither incredible nor improbable that the Israelites, in 215 years, should have increased to some two and a half million of souls, the other difficulties, about the lambs for the Passover, the departure from Egypt, the assembling at the tabernacle, the sojourn in the wilderness, the duties of the priests, etc., have been sufficiently obviated. They have all been considered, patiently in detail, in our former num-

ber,—at least, as far as our limits would admit. We have not intentionally avoided any difficulty; but have conscientiously endeavored to meet the Bishop's strongest points, and all his points of any weight in the question. As to the numbers in the Book of Chronicles, we have said nothing about them, and we shall say nothing about them here. We do not regard them as having any proper bearing upon our present discussion; and the Bishop was apparently led to refer to them only as a kind of make-weight with his other arguments. Let one thing be settled at a time; our question is now with the Pentateuch.

Is, then, the census of the Israelites when they came out of Egypt credible?

In the last number of this REVIEW we presented a hypothetical answer to this question in the form of a table. It was presumed in that table, and we supposed it would, of course, be so understood, that the number assigned to each generation was the number of *those surviving at the average age of 30 to 33 years*. And thus the surplus of the 4th generation after Joseph's death would about balance the deficit in the 3d.

To be more specific, suppose (1) this 4th generation, being between 3 and 33 years old, and averaging 20 years, to contain, say, $\frac{1}{10}$ (or 160,000) more than would survive at the average age of 33, thus adding 40,000 to the warriors. (2) The next preceding generation, the 3d, being from 33 to 63 years old, averaging 50, would contain, say, $\frac{1}{4}$ (or 100,000) less than survived at the average age of 33, thus diminishing the number of warriors by 50,000. (3) The other generation reckoned in the final sum, the 2nd, being from 63 to 93 years old, averaging 80, — the generation of Moses, — may be supposed reduced to $\frac{1}{2}$ of their number at 33, thus diminishing the population by 75,000. (4) Thus the number of warriors would be reduced by 10,000, i. e., would stand at 604,400; and the whole population would be reduced by 15,000, and would stand at 2,535,400; — a result which only brings us still nearer the precise enumeration of the text.

But as various specious objections may be made to the number of generations presumed in that table, to the periods and to the rate of increase assigned to each, &c., we propose to cut the whole matter short by calling attention to the following simple facts. 1. The rate of increase of the population of the Free American States, in the last 70 years, has been more than .033 (three and three tenths per cent) per annum.*

* If the slaves in the other States have not increased, as they should have done, at a still more rapid rate, it is only so much the more to the discredit of the slave-

2. A population of 102—the number of the Israelites of Ephraim's generation, with one wife each—would become $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions in 215 years by increasing at the rate of less than .0482 (or about four and eight tenths per cent) per annum.

Now here we have *the whole question reduced to its lowest terms*. Is this latter rate of increase, as compared with the former, absolutely incredible; so that it would be as irrational to undertake to prove it true by testimony, as to prove, by the same means, that "three and two make seven"? Or, suppose it proved, as a matter of fact, by sufficient evidence; would it be pronounced necessarily *miraculous*? We think not. We are clearly of opinion that there is no need of supposing a miracle to explain such a fact if admitted; at the same time that we are ready stoutly to maintain that *if* a miracle were necessary for the explanation, we should have a right, under the circumstances of the Mosaic history, to assume it.

But we will place the matter in yet another light.

1. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had an average of $2\frac{1}{2}$ wives (or concubines) each; and each wife an average of $2\frac{1}{2}$ sons who became heads of tribes or families. Here were three successive generations.

2. Now suppose the generation of Ephraim (51 males averaging, say, 5 years old,) and the two next following generations, (all within Joseph's lifetime,) to have averaged, in like manner, $2\frac{1}{2}$ wives for each man, and each wife to have had an average of $2\frac{1}{2}$ sons surviving to be heads of families; and assigning to these generations 25 years each, (as the text would expressly authorize us to do,)—we should then have, *without any further assumptions whatever*, the result of $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions at the end of the remaining 145 years, with an annual increase at the rate of less than .029. And even if we assign to those earlier generations of Ephraim, his children, and grandchildren, the usual space of thirty years each; the same result would be reached in the remaining 130 years, by an annual increase of considerably less than .033;—in either case, less than the rate of increase with which we are histori-

owners. Undoubtedly a system of slavery may be made so outrageously and abominably oppressive, or so excessively licentious, as to check the increase of population to any extent. The system of Negro Slavery is, in some places, so oppressive as to arrest that increase altogether, so that the slaves would die out were not their numbers recruited from abroad. And as to Free Negroes among us, their condition is made, *by the influence of slaveholders*, worse even, in many respects, than that of the slaves themselves. And yet it remains true that, *as a general rule*, the servile and lower castes and grades of society tend to a more rapid increase than the higher classes. Egyptian bondage was probably a light thing to negro slavery.

cally familiar. And surely it can hardly be pretended that the practice of polygamy to this extent, during the lifetime of Joseph,—which is the only extraordinary thing here assumed,—was either incredible or improbable.*

The attempt has been made to show that such a rapid increase of the Israelites as this, is incredible, because if the population of the United States were supposed to increase for a few hundred years at this rate, it would amount to fabulous numbers. But such an argument is a pure fallacy. If the population of the Free American States should continue to increase at the same rate as for the last 70 years, until A.D. 2000, it would amount to more than 1700 millions, i. e., to more than the present population of the globe; in A.D. 2140, to more than 154,000 millions; in A.D. 2210, to nearly 1500,000 millions; and in A.D. 2560, it would exceed the enormous sum of 113,000 million millions, or about 100 million times the whole present population of the globe. That population is not more than 20 to the square mile of dry land; this would therefore give some 2000 million, or nearly double the present population of the globe, to be crowded or rather heaped upon every square mile of land upon the earth's surface,—or upwards of seventy persons to every square foot. Is it therefore incredible that the population of the American States has, in the last seventy years, increased at a rate which leads to such monstrous results?†

* We have given above only the arithmetical data and results; leaving the latter to be verified by our readers, who can make the calculations for themselves.

† In our last we made certain strictures on the Rev. Dr. Mahan's reply to Bp. Colenso. We meant and we made no personal attack. We merely stated what, in good faith, we understood to be the Doctor's logical position; and should very sincerely regret if we misrepresented it. We even expressly disclaimed—which was more than we were bound to do—any charge or insinuation that the Doctor was consciously or intentionally maintaining one of Colenso's chief positions; while we endeavored to show, what we believed to be the fact, that he was really doing it. Dr. M. has seen fit to make a rejoinder, by three successive instalments in a certain weekly sheet. The two first having been placed under our eye, we have read them; the third, which we understand to be even more acrimonious and purely personal than its predecessors, we have not read and do not think of reading. We are not disposed to indulge in personalities, or to enter into any personal controversy.

Dr. M. complains of our having published our article in this REVIEW, which he is not accustomed to see. The simple fact is, we publish our articles where we please, and shall continue to do so; and if the Doctor's theological reading is so restricted that he does not see this REVIEW, so much the worse for himself. Besides, it seems hardly consistent for him, while making this complaint, to publish his rejoinder in a sheet which we, whether as a patriot, a Christian or a Churchman, could not encourage even with the patronage of a single individual, and which we had publicly announced (see *Episcopal Recorder* for Nov. 8, 1862) we were not accustomed to read.

Dr. M. complains that our quotations from him were "garbled". We did not intend they should be, and we do not think they were. Meanwhile,—what is most

The additional matter of Bishop Colenso's Part II may be referred to three heads; (1) Certain signs from names, etc., of a later origin in the Pentateuch; (2) The manner in which the Divine names, Jehovah and Elohim are used in the Pentateuch; and (3) The confirmatory argument from the use of the same names in the Psalms.

Now, under this first head, we find absolutely nothing new; nothing which has not been recognized and answered over and over again. The answers are found in Theological Treatises, in ponderous Commentaries, and erudite works on Biblical Criticism, which are not familiar or attractive to the ordinary reading public; while the Bishop arrays his objections as if they were new discoveries which the friends of Christianity

material,—we do not perceive that the Doctor either disclaims or retracts the position itself which we ascribed to him; and the object of the quotations was simply to show that he held that position,—the position, we mean, in regard to the *numbers* in Exodus. We are well aware that he does not stand alone in it,—Stanley and others may be with him,—but we note that he stands in it.

Dr. M. had said that Moses was "not a detailer of mere facts"; and we had said that the "mere" had no pertinency in the case. Of this also he complains. But until it shall appear that Colenso, or some of his friends or opponents have asserted or implied that Moses "*was* a detailer of *mere facts*", we shall take the liberty to think and say that the "mere" of Dr. M. is both irrelevant and impertinent. Colenso's *proper* opponents assert that Moses was a *narrator of facts*; if Dr. M. means to deny this, he sides with Colenso; we are not aware that any party considers Moses a "detailer of *mere facts*";—certainly, Colenso does not, and certainly his real opponents do not.

In regard to certain hypothetical ages of Jochabed and others, which we had suggested by way of concession to Colenso or of supposing the worst, and not because we maintained or admitted them to be true or necessary,—we had observed that they were "certainly *credible*, if the story of Abraham is credible". To this Dr. M. retorts; "I cannot but think there is a vast difference between the two cases. The story of Abraham rests on the authority of the Bible. The great age of Jochebed and others rests solely on Dr. G.'s arithmetic"—as if *credibility* were necessarily proportioned to *positive evidence*. If Dr. M. really does not know the meaning of "credible", we refer him to the first definition of the word in Webster's Dictionary.

The Doctor sneers at our logic, as though we did not know the difference between *yet* and *therefore*. We would by no means presume to compete with Dr. M. either in logic or in rhetoric. But is it possible that he counts so largely upon the *ars celare artem*, as to think to make us believe, that, in his childlike simplicity, he knows nothing of such a figure as *irony*, and is too innocent even to comprehend an insinuation? If a person, referring to Dr. M., should say that a man may be very supercilious and self-confident, and may assume a very lofty and dictatorial bearing; and yet have very little real substance in him;—or that a man may abound in the expression of noble sentiments, wear an air of perfect innocence and honesty, be remarkably smooth and fair-spoken; and yet be a very Jesuit at heart;—would the Doctor not think of taking offence, considering that the "*yet*" would logically imply the inference to be still in his favor? We wish it to be observed, we are far from applying such language to Dr. M. ourselves, and use it only by way of hypothetical illustration, with a view of bringing the case within the range of his intelligence, and, thus, to use his own words, "inculcating a wholesome lesson".

had never thought of before, or had studiously endeavored to conceal, and publishes them in a form and under circumstances such as will insure their being read by multitudes who rarely if ever read a Biblical Commentary or even the Bible itself. This is partly unfair, and partly unfortunate. The only way fully to answer the Bishop would be to follow him from step to step, to take up and refute his points in detail. And this would require a work of such an extent—for it ordinarily takes many more words to answer a plausible objection than to make it—as quite to shut it out from popular reading. In our restricted space we can at most give but a specimen or two of the Bishop's points, and we could heartily wish that he or some friend of his would designate one or two of what he regards as his strongest cases.

As to "sea-wind" [Heb.] for "west-wind" in Ex. x, 19,—we answer that we suppose the Israelites spoke Hebrew when they went down into Egypt, while they were in Egypt, and when they came out of Egypt, and not the Egyptian language. This certainly is the natural inference, we know no evidence to the contrary, and thus we see no difficulty in the use of the word in question.

The phrase "kings of Edom *before* there reigned any king over the children of Israel", Gen. xxvi, 31, does not, in itself, imply, according to Biblical usage, that there were ever any kings over Israel, but only that it was common for considerable nations to have kings, and natural to suppose that Israel might have them. See Matt. I. xviii, xxv, and v. 18.

The terms *Nabi* and *Roch*, *prophet* and *seer*, 1 Sam. ix, 9, may very naturally be supposed to have been in use in the earlier times, to have passed into desuetude in the period of the Judges, and subsequently to have been restored to colloquial usage.

The "Book of Joshua", and the book of the "Wars of Jehovah", may have been collections of martial odes, or poetical records contemporary with Moses and Joshua. Has any body proved the contrary?

"The Canaanite was *then* in the land", Gen. xii, 6; this Colenso argues must imply "but *not now*". But see Gen. iv, 26, "Then begun men to call upon the Lord"; Josh. xiv, 11, "As my strength was then so is it now"; Job xxxviii, 21, "Knowest thou it because thou wast then born?"

Colenso boldly says, "the Heb. ~~th~~, here translated 'then', cannot possibly be translated 'already,' as some have supposed". And yet, curiously enough, on page 125, he himself says: "And, generally, we are told that, *as early as* the time

of Enos, the son of Seth, 'then began men to call on the name of Jehovah'. Is it impossible, then, that *na*, which is here translated "then", should mean "already"?—The text in Gen. xii, 6, plainly means that the same people who were in the land in the writer's time, and who were soon to be expelled, were also there in Abraham's time.

We are utterly at a loss to know how Colenso has ascertained that the appellation "Hebrew", which seems to have been familiarly applied to the Abrahamic race by strangers, generally, from the very earliest times, "did not originate till a much later age".

That *הַעֲבֵרִי* or *הַעֲבָרִי* may refer to *either side* of Jordan, and need not mean *beyond* Jordan, is evident, as De Wette himself confesses, from Num. xxxii, 19, 32, and from other passages.

"Hebron," Gen. xiii, 18, was a name probably older than Kirjath-Arba, and subsequently restored. "Dan," Gen. xiv, 14, may have been Dan-Jaan; and the Salem of Melchizedek certainly need not have been Jebusi, afterwards called Jerusalem.

It is enough that the "sanctuary" was in existence before Moses died, and therefore the phrase "shekel of the sanctuary" may have been used by him in Ex. xxx, 13, etc.

The phrase "unto this day", occurs often in Joshua in a way that seems to imply a later writer; and we have supposed that the authorship of the book of Joshua, as a whole, is considered an open question by the most orthodox critics, or at least the editorship of it in its present form. Colenso has been able to find but two suspicious cases of the use of this phrase in the Pentateuch, which he has adroitly mixed up with a heap of citations from Joshua; one of these, Deut. xxxiv, 6 was plainly inserted after Moses' death; and the other, Deut. iii, 14, may be an accidental interpolation.

But we can pursue these details no farther. We must pass to his second head, viz., the manner in which the Divine names Jehovah and Elohim are used in the Pentateuch. This, he admits, is "the pivot as it were upon which the whole argument of the Part II turns". Yet, here again, he has but reproduced and set in a popular and plausible light the processes and results of German neology, which have long been familiar to theologians and scholars. Indeed the phenomena, especially in the book of Genesis, which have led to these rationalistic theories were very early observed both by the friends and by the enemies of Christianity;—in the Clementina, by Celsus, by the Gnostics and Manichæans, by Tertullian, Jerome, and Augustine, by the Rabbins Ben Jasos, and Aben Ezra. Hobbes,

Peirerius, Spinoza, and Le Clerc (who afterwards recanted), denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. They were refuted by Heidegger, Witsius, Carpzov, and Bishop Kidder, and, with some exceptionable admissions and adjuncts, by Spencer, Warburton and Michaelis. Vitringa and Astruc broached the *Document Hypothesis*, which was more fully developed by Eichhorn who presumed *two* original documents; Ilgen supposed three, and Gramberg, two with additions by a reviser. Vater found many more, and put forth the *Fragment Hypothesis*, in which he was opposed by Van Bohlen, and followed substantially by Vatke and others. Tuch invented the *Complement Hypothesis*, in which he was followed by Stähelin and others, and to which De Wette seems, on the whole, to have given his adhesion. This is, substantially, the theory adopted by Colenso. Hupfeld defended a similar theory under the form of three documents and a reviser. Ewald drifted from one theory to another, until he finally invented what has been called the *Crystallization Hypothesis*; in which he stands alone. On the other hand the unity and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch have been maintained by Ranke, Drechsler, Häverník, Keil, and Hengstenberg. De Wette admits that these theories on the Pentateuch lead necessarily to Strauss; and Davidson (Int. to O. T. p. 613) says: "It is true that various characteristic peculiarities of diction appear in common in the Elohistie and Jehovistic sections; but surely the later may have imitated the earlier writer, or the written materials whence both drew belonged to the same times";—thus begging, or rather surrendering, the whole question at issue. Indeed a similar minute dissection and conjectural criticism applied to the works of almost any old writer would lead to similar destructive and disintegrating results. To be convinced of this, one need only consult, a somewhat rare but very interesting literary curiosity, Bentley's edition of Milton's *Paradise Lost*.

The case with Genesis stands thus: Jehovah-Elohim is used in 4 chapters (ii, iii, ix, and xv); Jehovah alone in nine chapters; Elohim alone in 13 chapters; Elohim *and* Jehovah in 20 chapters; and neither in 4 chapters. But these chapters are not consecutive; the succession is as follows: first we have Elohim alone; then Jehovah-Elohim; then Jehovah *and* Elohim; then Jehovah alone; then Jehovah *and* Elohim; then Elohim alone; then Jehovah alone; then Jehovah *and* Elohim; then Jehovah alone; then Jehovah *and* Elohim; then Elohim alone; then Jehovah alone; then Jehovah *and* Elohim; then Elohim alone; then

Jehovah alone; then Jehovah *and* Elohim; then Elohim alone; then Jehovah *and* Elohim; then Elohim alone. Now let one read the book and note the unity and continuity of the story (for it is simply false to say that the 2nd ch. of Genesis, e. g., "contradicts the first"), and let him say which is the more probable, that we have here a confused patchwork of divers fragments,* or merely the naturally varying usage of one and the same writer?

We believe that the only text which occasions real difficulty in this part of the discussion is Exodus vi, 3; and we believe the difficulty is removed by a fair interpretation of the words, "by my name Jehovah was I not known to them". "By my name Jehovah", i. e., in my character of Jehovah, in the full significance of what I am as Jehovah, the God of revelation, the God of redemption, the God keeping his covenant and fulfilling his promises, he that was and is and is to come. Such an interpretation seems to us infinitely more reasonable than to suppose a flat and palpable contradiction between this and the preceding history, whether both were written or compiled by one author, or whether the various parts were written by several successive authors, of whom the later must of course have known what had been stated by the former. Indeed, viewed in the simple light of historical criticism, this passage presents a far greater difficulty for Colenso than for us.

We must hasten to his third head, the confirmation of his theory of the Pentateuch from the Psalms. Here he claims some originality, and perhaps justly; but his whole argument proceeds upon a most transparent begging of the question; first in regard to the historical order of the Psalms, and secondly in regard to the inference to be drawn from it.

Having first determined what are the earlier, and what the later Psalms of David, rejecting from the earlier any in which Jehovah preponderates, and from the later any in which Elohim preponderates, as in the case, for example, of Psalms xxxiv and cxlii†—he finds that Elohim is used more frequently in the earlier Psalms, and Jehovah in the later; and hence he infers that Jehovah was only gradually coming into use in the course of David's life, assuming that when it was once in use as the recognized and appropriate name of the

* Would Colenso, perhaps, trace to this the etymology of the word "*mosaic*"?

† "In short, the very circumstance that these two Psalms contain the name Jehovah so often, to the absolute exclusion of Elohim, is to my own mind, after what we have already seen, a clear indication that they cannot be ranked with the Psalms which were written at an earlier period of David's life. If written by David at all, of which there is no sign whatever, (?) they must have been written towards the close of his life." See page 213.

true God, the God of Israel, no pious Israelite would have failed to use it most frequently in preference to the colder and more general name, Elohim. It may be interesting to compare with Colenso's tables and results Lightfoot's chronological arrangement of some 20 Psalms which he ascribes to David, assigning them to different periods of David's life, erroneously, it may be, in some cases, yet without any bias connected with the question of the Divine names :

P.s.	EL.	Je.	P.s.	EL.	Je.
ix,	1	9	cv,	1	6
lvi,	9	1	cvi,	4	17
xxxiv,	0	16	lx,	5	0
clxii,	0	3	cviii,	6	1
lii,	5	0	lii,	2	6
liv,	4	1	xlvi,	13	1
lvii,	7	0	xlvi,	8	0
lviii,	2	1	lv,	6	2
lxxviii,	31	4	iv,	1	5
cxxxii,	0	6	v,	3	5

From this it would appear that Jehovah is used quite as frequently, in comparison with Elohim, in the earlier as in the later Psalms.

In regard to the 51st Ps.,—which, by the way, Davidson declares to be post-Davidic, Ewald assigns to some time after the destruction of the temple, Olshausen to the times of the Maccabees, and Hupfeld to the time after the captivity,—Colenso discourses thus : " This Psalm, we can scarcely doubt is the genuine utterance of David's ' broken spirit ' when he came to repentance after his grievous sin. In this Psalm he does not once use the name Jehovah. [We might ask how this should be at so advanced a period of David's life ; but Colenso proceeds.] It would seem as if in the anguish of his soul, he had recourse to the old familiar name, Elohim, as a more *real* name, a name dear to him from old associations, one which he had used all along in his childhood and youth, and in the better days of his ripened manhood, rather than the more modern name Jehovah, of new creation ". Of course, with such a style of reasoning, the Bishop can establish any conclusion he pleases, he can have no difficulties but such as he chooses to have, and must have abandoned the orthodox interpretation simply because he *preferred* to abandon it.

Psalm lx, which does not contain Jehovah once, but Elohim five times, he earnestly refers to the 45th year of David's life, though Davidson, Ewald, Olshausen, and Hupfeld concur in ascribing it to a later period.

But his argument from Ps. lxxviii he claims as especially his own, and as of paramount importance. This Psalm contains Elohim 31 times and Jehovah or Jah 4 times. It is, according to the ordinary view, ascribed by Colenso to David, and referred to the time of bringing up the ark to mount Zion; although Hupfeld, Ewald and Olshausen assign it to a much later date. From the coincidence of certain passages in this Psalm with parts of the Song of Deborah it is thought that the author of one must have borrowed from the other. But to the question, which is the original, Colenso unhesitatingly answers, the Psalm; "because", he says, "the Song is thoroughly *Jehovistic* as regards the use of the Divine name (E. 2, J. 13): and it is inconceivable that, if the word Jehovah was used so freely at *that* time, David should have used it so sparingly till a late period of his life". This is, again, a mere begging of the question. But he instances a particular passage as his strongest argument. While the Song of Deborah has: "Before Jehovah the Elohim of Israel", the Psalm has: "Before Elohim, the Elohim of Israel". "Our argument", he adds, "in short, is this: Of the two phrases, 'Elohim, the Elohim of Israel', and 'Jehovah, the Elohim of Israel', it seems certain that the former was the original expression, and that the latter was derived from it". We must confess this seems to us far from certain; for while Jehovah is the Elohim of Israel, Jehovah is also Elohim absolutely (see 1 Kings xviii, 39), and the Psalmist only rises to a still stronger expression of poetic feeling when he declares, not that *Jehovah* is the Elohim of Israel, but that *Elohim*, the universal, absolute Elohim, is the Elohim of Israel. That the Psalmist well knew and recognized that his proper name was Jehovah, is plain from the formal and solemn announcement of it in the 4th verse. "Sing unto God (Elohim) sing praises to his name; extol him by his name JAH and rejoice before him". Colenso also thinks, for similar reasons, that this Psalm is older than Num. x, 35; where we have: "Arise, Jehovah, and let thine enemies be scattered"; while, in the Psalm we have: "Let Elohim arise, and let his enemies be scattered." To which we make the same answer; and add that, perhaps the reason why Elohim is, in general, so much more used in the poetical, instead of Jehovah, which prevails in the historical compositions, may be, as suggested by Tuch, that such was the received peculiarity of the poetic style. Indeed it is not unlikely there is some reason, more or less consciously felt by the writer, and varying in strength from a *minimum* in some cases to a *maximum* in others, why either term, Elohim or Jehovah, is used from time to time in preference to

the other; though we should by no means follow Hengstenberg in his fanciful attempts to trace this reason out in all cases.

But that the ground of Colenso's general inference fails entirely is evident from the following, among other, facts: (1.) In David's *last words* (2 Sam. xxiii,) we have Elohim 3 times, Jehovah but once. (2.) In David's parting address to the people (1 Chron. xxix) we have Elohim 4 times, Jehovah-Elohim once, and Jehovah once. (3.) In David's blessing of *Jehovah* (in the same chapter) we have Elohim twice, Jehovah twice, and Jehovah and Elohim three times. (4.) In Solomon's prayer (1 Kings viii) we have Jehovah 6 times, Jehovah Elohe 6 times, and Elohim twice. Also, in the prayer of Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. xx,—and we call especial attention to this as bearing upon the present argument,—we find Elohim four times and Jehovah but once; while in the *historical* statements of the immediate context the name Jehovah is almost exclusively employed. In 2 Chron. vi, the names occur in nearly the same proportions. But in both texts, the solemn and sublime passage "Will God (Elohim) indeed dwell on the earth?" is to be especially observed. (5.) In Daniel's prayer, ch. ix, we have Jehovah our Elohim three times, Elohim (without Jehovah) 7 times, and Jehovah alone once; and Jehovah nowhere else in the whole book out of this chapter. And that the name Jehovah was still at that time in free familiar use is plain from the names Hananiah, and Azariah side by side with Daniel and Mishael. But had all these names ended in—*el*, it would have been no proof to the contrary, for in general, we should assign but little weight to a *negative* argument from names, as the fashion of names is known to vary quite arbitrarily from age to age. (6.) Colenso admits that Deut. was written after Numb., indeed, long after, he maintains; and yet, while in Numb. we have Elohim only 34 times and Jehovah 396 times, in Deut. we have Elohim 334 times, and Jehovah 550 times.

Colenso himself seems half aware that the ground is slipping away from under him, and makes strange contortions to preserve his position.

"We find", he says, "some *very late* Psalms in which there occurs a preponderance of the name Elohim."—"This accords also with the fact that, in the book of Ezra we have Elohim 97 times, Jehovah 37 times, and in that of Nehemiah, Elohim 74 times, Jehovah 17 times, contrary to all the data of the other historical books. It is quite possible that some of these Elohistic Psalms may be Ezra's. It would almost seem as if, after their long sojourn as captives in a strange land, when Israel no longer existed as a nation, they had begun to discon-

tinue the national Name for the Divine Being. However, if so, it must have soon been revived after their return from the captivity, since we find the later prophets using the term freely again,—Haggai (J. 35, E. 3), Zechariah (J. 132, E. 12), Malachi (J. 47, E. 8).” But what then becomes of the assumption that no pious Jew, if he knew the proper name Jehovah, and “*if the story of the giving of that name is really true*”, could possibly have failed to use it rather than Elohim? Does it, then, remain “impossible” that Ezra or Nehemiah, “or any other good man”, having known that Jehovah had declared, “This is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations”, should yet have habitually used Elohim instead of it?

Colenso might have added that, during the captivity, Ezekiel uses the name Jehovah freely, in all upwards of 400 times; while he has Elohim some 40 times, and El Shaddai once. A peculiarity of Ezekiel, is, that he more frequently uses Jehovah with *Adonai* prefixed; but here we find this remarkable phenomenon, that, in the first 12 and last 6 chapters, the use of *Jehovah* alone as compared with *Adonai Jehovah* is as 3 to 1½, while, in the remaining portion, it is only as 3 to 4. Were, then, the middle chapters written by a different author from him who wrote the first and last chapters, or must Ezekiel have written them at a widely different period of his life?

Colenso's *positive* theory of the authorship of the Pentateuch, at least, of the “Elohistic” portion of it, is worthy of his own character and position. While he conceives it incredible and impossible that Almighty God should inspire a man to utter his law at different times in a different form of words, as in Deut. v, for example, in comparison with Ex. xx,—he finds no difficulty in supposing that Samuel the prophet, “a great statesman and lawgiver, imbued from his childhood with deep religious feelings, and having early awakened in him—we cannot doubt, by special Divine Inspiration—the strong conviction of the distinct Personal Presence of the living God,—anxiously striving to convey the momentous truth with which his own spirit was quickened, to the young men of his school”, first invented and introduced the name Jehovah, and actually wrote, at so late a day, and out of his own head,—for surely he could not have been “specially inspired” to invent falsehoods,—the third and the sixth chapters of Exodus, for the purpose of bringing this new name into general and popular use;—and all this without being chargeable with impudent deception or pious fraud, or with dealing lightly or irreverently with sacred things, although he knew perfectly that not a

syllable he was writing about the solemn revelation of this incommunicable Divine Name had the slightest foundation in truth or fact. And then he supposes Gad, Nathan and others of Samuel's pupils and successors, to have followed with their Jehovistic revisions, interpolations, additions and continuations, naïvely inserting the name Jehovah throughout the antecedent as well as the subsequent history; although, if they had had the modicum of common sense and simple apprehension which even persons writing in Hebrew are ordinarily supposed to have possessed,—and that irrespective of their supernatural inspiration,—they must have known, and must have known that all their contemporaries knew, that this name Jehovah was a mere modern fiction, that it had first been invented and introduced by the prophet Samuel, and of course had been neither known nor thought of, much less used, by the patriarchs.

In assuming that he knows beforehand the ways and methods, degrees and conditions, according to which Almighty God must make a revelation to man, if he made one at all—in prescribing to God the course which his Divine character would require him to pursue—Colenso has had many predecessors. But to suppose that the prophet Samuel, acknowledged and lauded as a pious and holy man, could pursue such a course as that above indicated, required the Bishop of Natal, required a man who insists upon retaining a Bishopric in the English Church after he has openly denied the faith which he solemnly vowed to hold and preach, as a condition to his being invested with that sacred office.

ART. VII.—EXAMINATION OF THE LATEST DEFENCES OF DR. HICKOK'S RATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY.*

By EDWIN HALL, D.D., Prof. in Auburn Theological Seminary.

THE writer of the present article sees no reason why it should be necessary for him to argue over again the objections already urged against the Rational Psychology. Three able and zealous advocates of the Psychology, in six labored and extended articles, have tried what can be done in its defence; and the reviewer is quite content to leave the public to judge, whether his objections have been in any respect invalidated by any thing that has been urged in reply. It is his own unwavering conviction that they have not. The object of the present article is to show from the further development of the scheme in the recent articles of its defenders, from the false issues which they have been driven to assume, and from the evasions and representations to which they have been induced to resort, that the objections already urged are amply vindicated, and the scheme of the Psychology demonstrated to be incapable of any proper and valid defence.

The personal reflections in which four of these replies have so remarkably abounded, the reviewer has not deemed it necessary, or becoming in him, to notice. If it be true,—as Dr. Hickok charges upon him,—that his articles make it “most pitfully and painfully manifest”, that he is “utterly incompetent to enter into the meaning” of the Psychology; that his objections are “but sorry blunders of his own ignorance”, that he “manifests throughout an entire want of discernment” of important philosophical distinctions; “that if the Psychology were too obscure” for his apprehension, “he was not bound to review it until he had intelligently studied it”; that his review was but “the foul logic of an *Argumentum*

* [We deem it but fair that Dr. Hall should have an opportunity to reply to Dr. Hickok's and Prof. Lewis's articles in former numbers; and with this reply, in which no new points are we believe introduced, this discussion will close in this REVIEW. Both sides have been ably presented, and our readers are competent to form their own conclusions. The pressure upon our space, if there were no other considerations, will not admit of our continuing it.—EDITORS.]

ad ignorantiam and of an *Argumentum ab ignorantia*", which does not "afford sufficient inducement" to answer its objections;—or if it be true, as Prof. Lewis elegantly affirms, that the reviewer has been but "floundering" and "muddying the waters";—if all these, and many other allegations of the same sort be true, the public has doubtless long ere this observed it, and it would be idle for the reviewer to attempt any reply. His only consolation must be that such matters do not at all pertain to the question in debate.

It is indeed true that the present writer does believe in matter—"Hard Matter"—since Prof. Lewis so pleases; matter impenetrable; matter, so far as human experience goes, imperishable, and in its elements unchangeable; matter, to any power below that of the Creator, indestructible; matter that was created by God, out of nothing; and that, when God pleases, may cease to be. He believes in both matter and Spirit, as existences, which in their essence, properties, and phenomena, are entirely distinct and inconvertible. He does not believe with Prof. Lewis that there is no substance save spirit, nor that what is called matter is only spirit, or the activity of spirit in forceful counteragency with itself. Indeed, the faith of the present writer in the existence of "hard matter" is such that the strong expressions of Prof. Lewis concerning it are not without some ground. Says Prof. Lewis (p. 16):

"Never did the poor African seem more attached to his fetish, and more determined not to let it go, than Dr. Hall clings to this hard matter".—"Ask him what is more *real* than an *idea* dwelling in the mind of God; what is *stronger* than the power of God which *makes that idea dwell as an outward law in space*. He shakes his head. There is nothing there still he insists, unless we have something else, which is over and above the *idea*, the *law*, and the *force*."

Truly, he does shake his head. He does not comprehend how an *idea*, now dwelling in the mind of God, can be thrust out and made to dwell as an *outward law* [outward of the mind of God] in space. He does not suppose that an *idea* is matter, nor that a *law* is matter, nor that the *power*, which thrusts that idea out and makes it dwell in space as an *outward law*, is matter. He surely thinks that matter must be "something else."

In some other representations Prof. Lewis is less accurate. Thus, p. 2, he says:

"How do we positively know that there is a real outside world? Why, we smell it, Dr. Hall maintains; we take cognizance of it in the spiritual

olfactory; and all reasoning about it is superfluous, besides being a treasonable denial of something better and more religious. Reason and reasoning will make Pantheists, but sense is more orthodox."

Did Prof. Lewis mean to have this representation believed? "*Why, we know it by the smell, Dr. Hall maintains.*" Yet Dr. Hall expressly maintained the contrary, expressly designating the sense of smell as one which does *not* give immediate cognition of an outward material thing. And Prof. Lewis says he is not making a "caricature", but "stating Dr. Hall's position"! Nor is it true that Dr. Hall at any time decried either reason or reasoning. On the contrary he has uniformly maintained the proper functions of reason, and the validity of legitimate reasoning. He only showed that certain alleged demonstrations of reason were neither reason nor reasoning, but that in such matters reason was out of her sphere.

Of a similar character are the repeated representations of Prof. Lewis with regard to the alleged doctrine of "contact" between mind and matter. He speaks of "this language of Dr. Hall"—"this talk of soul *touching* matter" (p. 9.). He speaks of "this materialising theory of contact of which Dr. Hall is so fond", and describes it as "the dogma of *soul-contact*"—"a *touching*, (we use the language of the school) an ultimate *touching by the soul* of those primary qualities." (p. 5.). These representations Prof. Lewis repeats over and over again, dwells long upon them, and vehemently and eloquently declares the irreligious and atheistic consequences necessarily flowing from such theories and dogmas. Yet it is wholly untrue, and directly contrary to the truth in the case, that Dr. Hall any where intimates or advocates any such theory. On the contrary he expressly discarded all theories of the kind; maintaining that "*We can never tell how, at last, the connection is made between extended matter and unextended and immaterial mind.*"—"No man can explain it. No man can conceive how any thing can be done in the premises." He went further, and showed that *sensation*, as well as cognition, is utterly inexplicable; and that no theory either of "*contact, combination, or of intercommunication*", could give the required explanation; but that all attempts, on any theory, had ended only in absurdity. And this impossibility of giving any explanation either of sensation or of cognition, he urged as fatal to Dr. Hickok's scheme of giving an *a priori* explanation of "All Intelligence."

We proceed to another representation. The reviewer had noticed how Edwards, in his youth, beginning with the as-

sumption that, in sense, the mind has no conscious knowledge, save only of what is within, had come to the logical conclusion that there is no matter, and that the world exists only in idea: the reviewer had also noticed, that Newton on the same basis, had supposed that matter might be accounted for without the supposition of any substance, but by supposing that God simply renders a portion of space impenetrable, and gives it mobility, with other properties supposed to belong to matter. Thereupon Prof. Lewis exultingly claims Edwards and Newton as "Spiritual Realists," holding that nothing is real but spirit; that there is no matter, but only spaces filled with spiritual force,—the activity or "doing" of Spirit: and he thus charges Dr. Hall with perverting the words of Newton:

"All that he [Newton] could see in this matter, and all that he could say about matter, was this; that *"God by his power renders a certain portion of space impenetrable to another portion of space rendered likewise impenetrable."* Thus far the sentence gives a true representation of Newton's views. But Dr. Hall, as usual, must put in something of his own, and make nonsense of it. *He adds, immediately after Newton's statement the words "both spaces continuing absolutely void as before".* He has a "void", and not only a void, but an "absolute void" foisted upon Newton, who of all men abhorred a vacuum".—"In putting these words 'both spaces continuing absolutely void' into Newton's terse definition, Dr. Hall makes him not only contradict himself, but talk inconceivable nonsense" (p. 16.)

These charges are very definite, and, if true, of a very grave character. Dr. Hall has "added—to Newton's Statement"—"put words into Newton's terse definition" and so "foisted upon Newton" a meaning which Newton "abhorred", and "made him talk inconceivable nonsense". And this proceeding of Dr. Hall is characteristic, he has done "it" as "usual".

The public seeing these allegations under Prof. Lewis's own hand, and observing with what earnestness he reiterates them, and how long he rings the changes upon them, with such variety of holy horror and eloquent invective, would very naturally suppose them to be true. Unless Prof. Lewis were to be regarded as entirely unworthy of confidence, it would necessarily be concluded that he had referred to the words of Newton in question, and actually found that Dr. Hall had been guilty of doing what is here charged upon him. Yet Prof. Lewis has found no such thing. The charges are in every respect and wholly untrue, without the slightest shadow of any ground for making them. The words which Prof. Lewis affirms to be "Newton's Statement" and to which he

pays an especial compliment as "a true representation of Newton's view", are not the words of Newton at all, but Dr. Hall's own statement of Newton's conjecture: which statement Dr. Hall is glad to find Prof. Lewis so highly approves, not only as "a true representation of Newton's view", but as a "definition" so "terse" as to be not unfitly attributed to Newton himself.

The words of Newton were referred to in Wight's Hamilton (p. 303,) and are but a statement, from memory, by *M. Coste*,—the friend of Locke and Newton,—of a *conjecture* of Newton. "The following, said *M. Coste*, is the way in which he [Newton] explained his thought:

"We may be enabled, (he said,) to form some rude conception of the creation of matter, if we suppose that God by his power *prevents the entrance of any thing into pure space*; which is of its nature penetrable, eternal, necessary, infinite; for from henceforward, this portion of space would be endowed with impenetrability, one of the essential qualities of matter; and as pure space is absolutely uniform, we have only to suppose that God communicated the same impenetrability to another portion of space, and we should obtain, in a certain sort, another quality which is also essential to it."

It will be seen from this, that the charges of Prof. Lewis are wholly gratuitous and untrue, without the slightest foundation of any kind. It will be seen moreover, that Dr. Hall had accurately stated Newton's supposition, and that Prof. Lewis has "foisted upon Newton", a notion to which the words in question make no allusion, and which there is no evidence that Newton ever held:—viz., the notion that God rendered the space impenetrable by so filling it with his own Spiritual activity in forceful counteragency with itself, as to become perceptible to our senses. The conjecture of Newton was, that "God, by his power *prevents the entrance of any thing into pure space*". But "pure space" is void space; and Newton's conception was, of the space *continuing pure*, while God *prevents the entrance of any thing into it*. Dr. Hall, therefore accurately stated the idea of Newton, while Prof. Lewis it is who has foisted upon Newton a notion to which, for aught that appears, Newton was an entire stranger.

The evidence on which Prof. Lewis relies to prove that Newton held the space to be so filled with a Spiritual counteragency as to be impenetrable, is contained solely in the words which he cites as "Newton's Statement": viz., that "God, by his power renders a certain portion of space impenetrable, etc". "This", says Prof. Lewis, was "all that Newton could see in this matter" and "all that he could say about matter",

and all that he could *see* in matter, or rather *think* in matter". (p. 147.) Prof. Lewis then confesses that he has seen nothing in Newton's writings, utterances, or opinions, beyond what is expressed in these words. Nay, he affirms that they are "a true representation of Newton's view", and all that Newton could "see", or "say" or "think" in "matter", or "about the matter". Well, then, Prof. Lewis confesses that these words contain all the evidence in the case, that Newton, or whoever was their author, held any such view as he attributes to Newton—viz., that there is no matter, save space rendered impenetrable by filling it with a spiritual activity in counter-agency. Then Prof. Lewis must necessarily confess further, that he has "foisted upon Newton" sentiments which Newton never expressed, and which there is no evidence that Newton ever held: for the words in question are not the words of Newton, but of Dr. Hall; and Prof. Lewis has foisted upon them a meaning which Dr. Hall never conceived as belonging to them, and which he utterly abhors.

That Edwards held no such view, is evident from the fact that he discards, at last, the idea of any perception of any outward force or resistance, and concludes that matter and worlds and resistances have no existence save in idea; creation consisting simply in God's *raising up such ideas* in finite minds. Beginning with the assumption that we directly *cognize* nothing save what is within, he for a moment supposed the perception of an *outward resistance*. Yet it was but a moment before he perceived that this conclusion was entirely illogical, and he at once abandoned it. A moment's reflection showed him that the principle *that we immediately cognize only what is within, is as conclusive against an outward force or resistance, as against an outward substance*: he in one breath changed his previous conclusion, and decided that we cognize not even an outward resistance, but only our own idea. And to this conclusion Dr. Hickok and Prof. Lewis must come at last, or else renounce their notion, that in sense we cognize only what is within. "*Resistance*" said Edwards, "*is but the mode of an idea*". "How is there resistance, except it be *in some mind*"? "The material universe *exists nowhere but in mind*". "*Place* itself is mental: and *within* and *without* are mere mental conceptions".—"The material universe is absolutely dependent on the conception of the mind for its existence (Carvill's Ed. Vol. i. p. 670-1). Edwards, therefore, utterly rejected the notion which Prof. Lewis attributes to him.

Prof. Lewis says that "Dr. Hall intimates that Edwards

could not see the tendency of his own reasoning". Dr. Hall certainly gave no such intimation, but on the contrary maintained that Edwards *did* see the tendency of his reasoning, and that he carried it out truly to its legitimate consequences. Even in his youth, before Kant was born, Edwards, assuming the principles afterwards assumed by Kant, and now assumed by Dr. Hickok and Prof. Lewis, carried them out, in a few brief and simple steps of the soundest logic, to nearly all the strange conclusions reached with so much labor and difficulty by three generations of German philosophers. Prof. Lewis is delighted with his fancied discovery that he has Edwards on his side in the results which he has already reached. It may do him good to see what further conclusions Edwards reached beyond. Following out the principle for which Prof. Lewis now does battle so valiantly, Edwards concluded that "*Bodies have neither substance nor property*" (p. 725.) "*Spirits are the only proper substance*" (p. 708.) "*All that is real is the First Being.*" It may be possible by subjective thought, "*from the present state of the world—to form a perfect idea of all its past changes*". "*Nothing is something*" and "*Space is God*" (p. 670.) Only one step further has been reached by the German philosophy, and that is that "*Seyn=Nichts,*"—"*Being is Nothing,*" all is resolved into "a marvellous dream, without a life to dream of, and without a mind to dream". Prof. Lewis is already well advanced in this "path which philosophy has for so many ages been travelling": but go on Prof. Lewis, the logical end of your career is not yet.

There can be no doubt that Prof. Lewis says truly, when he says "There was as much light at Northampton as there is now in the chair of Theology at Auburn". Doubtless there was, and a great deal more. At Auburn, scarcely any uninspired man is held as at all comparable to Edwards. What then? Must we therefore receive these speculations as true? They form no part of the "light" of Edwards at Northampton. Not the slightest trace of them is found in any thing that he wrote after he came to years of maturity. There is no reason to suppose that he ever carried those speculations to Northampton. They were written when he was in college, a boy not seventeen years old. When he became a man, he seems wholly to have put away such childish things. And now, Prof. Lewis, having chanced to become partially informed of such speculations of Edwards, carries them in formal procession, with great proclamation and parade, challenging any one who "dares,"—"if it pleases him, to make light of things which called out the deepest thoughts of Edwards, or of

Newton." (p. 40.) Yet not the slightest evidence appears to show that either of them held the notion that Prof. Lewis attributes to them, viz. of space rendered impenetrable by being filled with spiritual acts in forceful counteragency.

Prof. Lewis himself for a moment supposes the possibility of preventing the entrance of any thing into a space, by another method, viz. "Simply by the activity of *will*". The vehemence with which he at first maintains this position, and the equal vehemence with which he the moment after spurns it and abandons it, is very amusing. Hear him.

"Will Dr. Hall say that God cannot *simply by the activity of his will*, so make a certain space affected that he, Dr. Hall, cannot enter it without being driven back? Such a denial would surely look like running upon the thick bosses of the Almighty's buckler".

If it will calm the agitation of Prof. Lewis, in view of so great anticipated temerity on the part of Dr. Hall, let him quiet himself with the assurance that Dr. Hall feels no disposition to make such a denial, nor is he at all tempted, in that way, to rush upon the thick bosses of the Almighty's buckler. He assents to the declaration of Prof. Lewis, that "God's very *command* is power". He accepts cordially the supposition of Newton, that God may "by his power prevent the entrance of any thing into pure space". But he does not suppose that that "*command*" or "*will*" are obliged to put themselves into a forceful counteragency, and to fill the space with a spiritual—physically—resisting force, perceptible to the senses, in order to prevent the entrance of any thing into that space. Nor does he suppose that to prevent the entrance of any thing by *command* or by *will*, is necessarily the same thing as to fill it with a physically resisting force, composed of the Divine Spirit, or activity, in forceful counteragency with itself. Prof. Lewis indeed affirms the last to be "the same thing" with the first. But where did he learn that God has no other *power of command*, or method of executing his *will*, in such a case,—than by such a physical counteragency of his own spirit, making itself perceptible to our senses? How came Prof. Lewis to know so much about the physical force of such counteragency of the essence or the activity of the Godhead in forceful antagonism with itself? Where was he when God laid the foundations of the earth, that he should be able thus authoritatively to declare the method of doing it, and to see that no other method was possible to the Creator! And why will not Prof. Lewis explain to us what it is for the essence, or the activity, or the Spiritual acts, of such a Spirit, to come into such coun-

teragency; and how he knows that such spiritual counteragency becomes a space-filling force perceptible to the senses?

And here we have a little matter to settle with both Prof. Lewis and Dr. Hickok, in which, unable to answer, as it seems to us, they have evaded the true question, and substituted another issue entirely different from the question in debate. Dr. Hickok had professed to see that matter is necessarily produced by the acts of a Spiritual being in forceful counteragency with each other: and that, the counteragency continuing, the impenetrable substance so formed must necessarily grow into a world with precisely all the cosmical arrangements of this world of ours. This is the corner-stone of his philosophy. If this is not seen by the reason to be an eternal principle and necessary truth, then by the very conditions of the Rational Psychology, man has no faculty of reason, and can never know that there is an outward world or God, or any thing. Dr. Hickok's friend and pupil in the Princeton Review, p. 99, also fully maintains this. He says, "Matter may thus be the product of Spirit and cognizable by it," and thus this theory "*removes the gulf, in other systems impassable*, between the Creator and the creature, the knowing mind and the material objects of knowledge". The claim is thus very modestly made that without the reception of this all-important principle of Dr. Hickok's philosophy, the "gulf" is "impassable" between man and the knowledge of God, or of an outer world! Dr. Hickok expressly declares, that the prevalent philosophy of the Christian world can lead only to Pantheism; that his philosophy is the only remedy, and that without our reception of it, our faith in the Christian creed can be only "an unreasoning credulity". The principle in question is therefore the

"Sole prop and pillar of a sinking world".

Perhaps the reviewer was not conscious of the tremendous consequences of weakening the foundation of that pillar, when he ventured to suggest that "nothing is hazarded in affirming that Dr. Hickok has no conception of any possible meaning in what he affirms" of the acts of a Spirit in forceful counteragency with each other. To test the possibility of forming any conception of what this means, the reviewer made three suppositions which he regarded as exhaustive; no further supposition remaining possible on the subject; while each of these is palpably absurd.

(1) "Is it the activity of intelligence or thought pressing physically against a similar activity"?

(2) "Is it the essence of Spirit pressing physically against a similar essence?"

(3) "What are these '*acts*'? Are they entities distinct from the spirit itself in action? If so, then Dr. Hickok should tell us how to create a spiritual *act*, and to throw it off as a distinct entity, and to put it into that "*push and pull*" with another act, which constitutes "*counteraction, complex action, and reaction*", (Cosmology p. 93) and so creates an "impenetrable substance."

To these inquiries Prof. Lewis replies thus:

"But Dr. Hall says, Nothing is hazarded in affirming that Dr. Hickok has no conception of any possible meaning in what he affirms about *spiritual activity*. The ground of this rather hazardous assertion is, that neither he, Dr. Hall, as he seems to confess, nor any other man, as he rather hazardedly implies, can conceive of *spiritual activity*, except as thought or intelligence; and he asks, 'Is it the activity of intelligence or thought pressing physically against another similar activity.'"

It will be seen that this statement of Prof. Lewis is in all essential respects entirely diverse from the truth in the case. The question was not about *spiritual activity*, as Prof. Lewis represents, but about a Spiritual activity in *physical and forceful counteragency against another similar activity*. Prof. Lewis has entirely misrepresented the reviewer's objection as to its matter, its ground, and its form. He has entirely changed the issue, and wholly evaded the question in debate. Would he have done this had he seen any possibility of answering the question truly and fairly? But he is not content without adding another evasion. He argues at length that "Dr. Hall is answered by a consideration of the human spirit"—"When a man lifts or propels a hundred pounds, it is ultimately by the soul he does it,"—"and that too not simply by the soul as determining will, using the outward means, but as *potentia potens*, or spiritually indwelling force, that is a really spiritual thing."

Doubtless the spirit originates or sets in motion all the force which man or beast is capable of exerting. We need not stop to debate whether it be "*potentia potens*", not by "using the outward means", but by the indwelling force of spirit itself, or whether it be in some other way beyond our comprehension. Certainly, on the theory which Prof. Lewis declares, the spirit of man must have far less force than that of an ox or an ass: while in man and beast, the force is ever proportioned to the bulk and physical condition of the animal. Sickness or age may reduce it in the strongest man to the feebleness of a child.

Be all this as it may, it is nothing at all to the question of the spiritual acts of a pure spirit *in forceful counteragency with each other*: but a simple evasion.

And now we have a similar account to settle with Dr. Hickok on the same question. In all his three replies he makes no answer to the objection contained in these inquiries. Twice expressly challenged, that he himself has no conception of any possible meaning in what he affirms in this matter, he is silent. If neither he nor any other man can form a rational conception of what such counteragency can possibly be, then neither he nor any other man can see it, as a necessary truth, that the result must be an impenetrable substance. Dr. Hickok demands that we receive it as a necessary truth without reasoning, or explanation. But a necessary truth, — a principle of rational insight, — is a truth which bears with it its own irresistible evidence to the reason of all men. If this were a necessary truth, all men would see it as clearly as Dr. Hickok: none could fail to see it: none could doubt it. Dr. Hickok indeed claims, that one in the habit of thinking, can see deeper than others. Prof. Lewis intimates the same. But while practised mathematicians and practised thinkers may make a wider application of necessary truths, they have no clearer apprehension of axioms and necessary truths themselves than the veriest child. No man sees the principle in question to be a necessary truth. We challenge Dr. Hickok, that he does not see it. Twice have we challenged him, that so far from seeing that spiritual activities in forceful counteragency necessarily produce an impenetrable substance he has no conception of any possible meaning in what he affirms of such spiritual counteragency; and consequently can have no rational insight of its necessary results. Under the strongest inducement to explain it, and to show that another conception is possible besides the three which we have set forth as exhaustive on the subject, he is silent. His whole system is at stake. His whole credit as a philosopher centres here. If such result of a spiritual counteragency be not a necessary truth, then his whole Psychology and his whole Cosmology tumble into ruins. On his own principles, if this matter of rational insight fails, then man can never know an outward world, or God, or any thing; but the skeptic remains with his "logical right to doubt whether matter or mind has any existence."

We are now authorized to repeat the challenge with double emphasis; that Dr. Hickok has no conception of any possible meaning in what he affirms concerning spiritual counteragency; since in his last article, with the question fully before him, and

endeavoring to parry its force, he has not met it, but has changed the issue, and taken refuge in a palpable evasion; a proceeding which of itself is a confession of defeat and overthrow in a point decisive of the destiny of his whole philosophy. Pressed by the objection that the supposed "acts" or "activity" of a spirit, in the supposed counteraction, can be nothing save the spirit itself in action, forcefully impinging against itself, and that on this scheme "the Creator himself in counteragency with himself, is himself the world he makes", and that "so we end in pantheism," Dr. Hickok, p. 212, thus specifically replies to this specific objection:

"This charge [Pantheism] is sustained by affirming that it [the Psychology] holds God to be the immediate author and upholder of the forces which compose matter, and thus makes the forces to be God: and also that it teaches matter to be the necessary product of the creating Deity."

"In reference to this last charge, it is admitted that the philosophy, both of the Psychology and of the Cosmology, holds that matter is an immediate product from God, and also that without his immediate support it would cease to exist."—"Instead of an objection, it is the necessary postulate of a Theistic philosophy that it should teach matter to have immediately originated from God, and perpetually to be sustained by God. The Bible doctrine of the Logos-creation is wholly consistent with this, for the Logos-Creator was with God, and was God from the beginning."

That matter was *created* immediately by God, and is perpetually upheld by God, is indeed the teaching of the Bible, and "the necessary postulate of a Theistic philosophy". Unless in the phrases "immediate product from God" and "immediately originated *from* God", there is wrapped up a reserved meaning, like that which Prof. Lewis openly avows, viz. that matter and worlds were not "*created*" of nothing, but only "*formed*" out of "*ante-mundane*" and "*unseen things*";—"evolved" out of the act or essence of the Logos, "the Great form of God," and so are not "*things*" but "*doings*" "*events*" "all of them from the floating mote to the rolling world"; [*"Hard Matter"*, p. 38],—the "*doing*" of a spirit,—with no reality or substance distinct from spirit:—if no such meaning as this is covered up by the phrases in question, then this statement of Dr. Hickok contains nothing different from the necessary postulate of a Theistic philosophy, or from the statements of the Bible.

And did Dr. Hickok really suppose, that this was the ground, or any thing like the ground, on which his scheme was charged as Pantheistic? That charge was specifically and distinctly made *as the logical result of the scheme of the supposed spiritual counteragency, and on no other ground.* Did Dr. Hickok

wish to make his readers understand that his scheme was charged as Pantheistic, simply on the ground that it teaches the Bible doctrine, and the necessary postulate of a Theistic philosophy, viz. that God directly created and upholds the world? One thing is clear, that Dr. Hickok has not met the question at all, but has simply evaded it, and that, under the strongest inducement to meet it fairly, had he seen it possible. Are we not now authorized to consider our challenge as finally settled,—that Dr. Hickok has no conception of any possible meaning in what he affirms of the alleged spiritual counter-agency; and consequently, that he cannot see it to be a necessary truth, that such counteragency must produce an impenetrable substance? This vital point in his philosophy failing, the whole scheme tumbles into hopeless ruin.

Nor did the reviewer affirm,—as Dr. Hickok declares in the extract given,—that the Psychology “*also teaches matter to be the necessary product of the creating Deity*”. The reviewer affirmed nothing of the kind, but something far worse, viz: that the scheme required no Deity, and left no evidence of the existence of a Deity in the things that are made: since the scheme required neither wisdom, nor knowledge, nor thought, nor design, nor will, nor consciousness, in the Creator; but only an antagonism of force; whose results must be the same whether the Creator had any thought, or will, or consciousness, or not.

Dr. Hickok's method is as follows: He first alleges, as the ground of the necessity for his philosophy, such a contradiction between reason and consciousness, as, in the existing state of all philosophy, destroys all possibility of knowledge of an outer world. This contradiction Dr. Hickok does not state,—as has been affirmed—as “belonging solely to the Skeptic”, but states it *originally*, in his *own person*, in his *own behalf*, and merely brings in the *admission* of the skeptic to corroborate *his own statement*: and this, whoever takes pains to turn to the passages in his Psychology, will find to be exactly the truth in the case. In the present state of philosophy, then, he assumes that we know no world; nor whether experience is possible, nor whether there is, or can be any faculty of reason. He doubts all, and undertakes to demonstrate all. But to do this, he takes nothing from facts, since we know not that there are any facts, or that we could know them if there were. Unless we can *transcend* all experience, the dispute between reason and consciousness he declares to be a “drawn battle”, which can never be ended. Using the unfound and perhaps impossible reason to tell *à priori* all that sense and understanding can be

made to do, he comes at last to find the Reason. This he determines to be a *comprehending* agency, and assumes that if reason be possible, it must be able to comprehend the universe: and that to comprehend the universe, it must be able to tell *à priori* how it must *begin*, and what must be its *end*. But such comprehension he declares to be impossible without the compass of an Absolute. He then undertakes *à priori*, as before worlds were made, to find the Absolute, as an *à priori* position for finding the reason. Here to comprehend how the universe must *begin*, he forms the "reason conception" of two forces in counteragency—tantamount to "*the simple force of gravity*": and professes to see *à priori* that such counteragency, or gravity, must necessarily produce an impenetrable substance: which, the counteragency continuing, must necessarily grow into just such a world as ours. So far, he supposes no Absolute, and requires no wisdom, or knowledge, or consciousness, or will, but only forces in counteragency; and he sees by "an eternal and unmade principle" which "conditions all power, and is itself conditioned by no power," that such must be the result of such counteragency, and can be the result of nothing else.

Now to account for the force, Dr. Hickok supposes a Spirit, the Absolute: who, of thought and design, puts his activities into counteraction. But what sort of Absolute? He can use no wisdom, nor design, in ordering the cosmical arrangements of the universe. If he puts his acts into counteragency, just such a world is made, and he cannot help it. Dr. Hickok could have told him all about it *à priori*. He needs no thought, or knowledge, or wisdom, or will, or consciousness; for if his acts come into counteragency by *chance*, or by *necessity*, or while he is *unconscious*, the result is necessarily the same. The created universe on this scheme, can show forth the glory of no Creator, save one, who, for aught that appears, might be one destitute of thought or of consciousness.

Such was the objection of the reviewer. How entirely different from Dr. Hickok's representation, that it affirmed that the Psychology "also teaches matter to be the necessary product of the creating Deity"! The scheme demands no Deity, and furnishes no evidence of one. It shows how the world can *begin* with no exercise of any functions of Deity, save of a blind, unconscious force. What else was to be expected of a philosophy, which, under pretence that existing worlds employ only our lower faculties, and can therefore never lead to the knowledge of God, throws away these worlds through which, God himself declares, his "Eternal power and Godhead" are "clearly seen", and then attempts to ascend to "the Absolute"

by a "reason-conception",—such as man can form,—of the necessary process by which God must create matter if at all; and to tell, *a priori*, what sort of worlds such a counteragency of spiritual acts must necessarily produce!

Prof. Lewis complains bitterly of the reviewer for getting up "such an uproar about pantheism,—that bugbear word"; and though he "would not be uncharitable," he can account for the reviewer's proceeding, only by supposing that the reviewer is intent on getting up an "unreasoning *odium theologicum*" against Dr. Hickok! Dr. Hickok may charge the whole Christian world with entertaining a philosophy which can end only in pantheism: he may affirm that "*All theology without philosophy is a credulous superstition.*" (Cosmology, p. 21): he may set forth his own philosophy as the only relief from atheism or pantheism, and declare that, without our receiving it, our reception of the Christian creed is an "unreasoning credulity": but if one ventures to examine that philosophy, and to show whereunto its principles tend, Prof. Lewis regards it as a personal outrage, a desire to raise an "*odium theologicum*", "against one, who though deeply philosophical, is perhaps the least controversial—amid all the writers of the land"! Must there, then, be no controversy with any speculations which Dr. Hickok may set forth? When he comes with such a boon to the Christian world, has the Christian world no duty or prerogative in the case, save quietly to renounce its philosophy, lay its hand upon its mouth, and answer not again?

But if the objection of Prof. Lewis regards only the "uproar about pantheism", then we turn to the developments of the scheme under the hand of Prof. Lewis himself, to show that our anticipations were just, and that sooner than we expected, the scheme has borne its fruits.

Prof. Lewis resolves all being into spirit and the doings of spirit. "Hard Matter", is, with him, "an inconceivable conception", an "idealess idea". (p. 6) "It is no thing for the sense of any sentience; it is no thing for the reason. To us therefore it is *nulla res*, not a *res*, it is *unreal*, it is nothing" (p. 22) What is it then? Nothing but the "doing" of a spirit: and what can this be, save a *spirit in the act of doing, with no substance or thing besides himself*? "They are not standing things, but *doings* all of them, doings of invisible powers. They are all *events* from the floating mote to the rolling world". (p. 38) "The real things that stand, are *forces, ideas, laws*." The "*forces*", as plural, having diversity before creation", and the "*ideas*", (he says,) "together form the *unseen things*, from which, the Apostle says, were made the things that are seen".

To get this meaning out of the apostle, and to avoid the common understanding of the passage, as teaching that the worlds were made, not out of "*ante mundane*" materials, but out of nothing,—Prof. Lewis finds it necessary to alter our received text of the Scripture from $\mu\eta\ \epsilon\kappa\ \text{to}\ \epsilon\kappa\ \mu\eta$ — $\phi\alpha\iota\upsilon\omicron\mu\epsilon\acute{\nu}\omega\upsilon\omicron$: which he attempts to justify by the authority of some ancient translations. These "forces, ideas, and laws," he says "constitute the only real things that stand". What were these antemundane forces, "having diversity"? Were they *entities* distinct from God, so that there were *two* ante-mundane subsistences, God and his force or power? Or was there but one, the *Powerful God*? And was the "*idea*" an entity distinct from God, or was not all comprised in one,—*God thinking*? Was the "*law*" a separate entity, making two subsistences, or was all included in one,—*God willing*? Indeed, on the plan of Prof. Lewis, can there be any matter or world, save *God himself in act*, according to a certain *idea* and *law*, which are his own thought and will? The Creator himself in act thus constitutes the world he makes: the Creator himself constituted "the unseen things" out of which he made the worlds.

But Prof. Lewis does not leave us to come to this conclusion simply by logical inference, however direct and inevitable. He avows it; quotes scripture to prove it; and doubly proves it by two mathematical formulas. First, he proves it by scripture, thus:

"Ah, but the pantheism!"—"This force you talk of is God's force, and so there is not matter aside from God." [How clearly Prof. Lewis anticipates the logical conclusion of his scheme!] "We are not careful to answer Dr. Hall in this matter. By the help of scripture we cut the Gordian knot. The Bible says, "*God is all and in all.*"

Where does the bible say that, in the sense intended? The passage in which are found the expressions nearest to those cited by Prof. Lewis, and the one doubtless to which he refers, is Col. 3: 11, "Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but *Christ is all and in all.*" What has this to do with proving that there is no matter nor mundane world save God?

Secondly he proves it mathematically, thus:

"Dr. Hall no more escape the conclusion of pantheism than others. He is too good a theist to maintain that his matter, be it ever so hard, could remain one moment without the imminent power of God"—"Take away then, this divine power from the space where, and the time when, this hard matter is, and immediately there is nothing left. It would seem therefore like an axiom of the mathematics, that there could have been nothing there before, besides that which is taken away, and that is *Divine, that is God.*"

So Prof. Lewis proves that the hard matter of the world is God! We do not receive such mathematics. We suppose that God may create a veritable material world, which is not himself nor spirit; that he may uphold it; and that when he withdraws his power, that world will cease to be; yet do we not regard this as proving that there can be no material world that is not God!

But to make his conclusion firm and good, Prof. Lewis gives a second mathematical demonstration: or rather an argument which seems a compound of the *argumentum ad hominem* and of mathematics, (p. 27).

"Dr. Hall believes in an anti-mundane state when God was all. Let us repeat to him the question given a little way back: Has God ceased to be all? Then the all is more than it was, or God has become less. In either case he is comparatively finite. Now where would Dr. Hall stand, in answer to such a perfectly clear mathematical statement? Why, with his back to the wall, crying out Mystery, Mystery, O the depths!"—"O vain boasting reason! strive for the faith once delivered to the saints!"—"Beware lest any man spoil you with philosophy and vain deceit."

Prof. Lewis doubtless believes his own reasoning, and thinks he has mathematically, and doubly, demonstrated the impossibility that there should be either matter or worlds besides God; and that he has also proved the same from the scriptures. If he may not believe mathematical demonstration, or the word of God, what may he believe? We are loth to receive this witness of himself: we hope he may yet see some way out of this philosophical quagmire, and that, without the necessity of denying the authority of scripture or of mathematical demonstration. *As he stands at present, is he not a pantheist?* Let us call Dr. Hickok and ask him: Dr. Hickok—as Prof. Lewis now stands, is he not a Pantheist? Dr. Hickok answers; (*Cosmology*, p. 21) "*If the universe be absorbed in the Deity, it is Pantheism.*" Call another expert, (*in Krauth's Vocabulary of Philosophy*). He answers, "Pantheism supposes God and nature, or God and the whole universe, to be one and the same substance—one universal being;" Call another expert (*Ibid. citing Lacoudre, Inst. Philosoph.*) "*Pantheistae, qui contendunt unicam esse substantiam, cujus partes sunt omnia entia quae existunt.*" So Rev. Dr. James Murdock, in his work on "The Modern Philosophy," p. 185, (*citing Krug's Philosoph. Lexikon; art. Pantheismus*) says "They expressly deny that God created or produced the world out of nothing, or that he gave existence to beings and things the substance or matter of which had no previous existence: they say he created or brought forth the world from himself"

—"thus constituting an absolute unity, as to essence or substance".

The case of Prof. Lewis, then, as represented by himself, furnishes ample evidence that the anticipations of the reviewer with regard to the tendency of Dr. Hickok's scheme, were eminently correct. Sooner than he anticipated that scheme has borne its fruits.

Prof. Lewis is, however, entirely mistaken in supposing that in view of these mathematical demonstrations, Dr. Hall must "stand with his back to the wall, crying out Mystery, Mystery, O the depths"! Dr. Hall sees neither mystery, nor mathematics, nor depths, nor reason, nor common sense, in such demonstrations. Nor is he disposed to stand with his back to the wall over such reasoning, unless it be in pity and in sorrow, that an aged man, a Christian, and a scholar, should allow himself to be so far carried away by so shallow a sophistry, as, in his old age, to avow the impossibility of believing in any other system save one which makes God and the substance of the world identical. The whole force of the sophistry lies in giving to the words "all" and "infinite" two senses, and then arguing concerning them as though each had only one exact mathematical meaning. The Christian world has long believed, that God created the world, and that, both before and after creation, God is equally infinite; nor have they seen any mathematical or other difficulty in such a belief. If now Prof. Lewis believed the rational soul of man to be created and not eternal, then each of these arguments would prove with equal validity, the godhead of every human soul; as it would also of the spirit of every beast. For take away the Divine power, and they cease to be. The conclusion of Prof. Lewis's argument, then, is, that there was nothing there before save what was taken away, so that the human soul or the spirit of the beast, was "*Divine, was God.*" So also of his other mathematical argument: each human soul, and the spirit of each beast, either makes the sum of existence more, or God less, so that in either case he is less than infinite, if what is created is aught else than God.

But Prof. Lewis holds that the rational part of man was not created, but partakes of the infinite and the eternal; that it comes "from its preëxistent sphere", "truly divine", and furnished with "divine" and "eternal ideas": that man "sees ideas and forms in nature, and (*αναγιγνωσκει*) reads them",—"knows them *again*,"—"remembers them as thoughts of God given in his image", (p. 26); that whatever truly *is*, *is* forever. Man has in him the Eternal, therefore man *is*, and

is forever. The world is but a manifestation—a manifestation of the eternal; and therefore that which it manifests, and that alone truly *is*" (p. 41).

If, in these respects, man is eternal and divine, then God is not his Creator, but either man is part of the Godhead, or there is another being and intelligence that is eternal and self-existent besides God. Here is surely a basis for that principle of Moral Philosophy, which gives to man, as a *person*, an absolute *autonomy*; he is bound to worship and serve God, not—as our Catechism says—"Because he is God and our Father", but only from what man owes to his own spirit-worthiness.

It is now thirty years, and more, since this philosophy reached its logical culmination in this country. Rev. Dr. Murdock, in his *Sketches of Modern Philosophy, especially among the Germans*", published in 1842, shows (from the Dial, and other authentic documents) that "American transcendentalism" had already reached the conclusion, that since God is all, and our souls portions of God, whatever we do, God does: there can be no sin, but only a progressive development; and our duty is "to foster the Divinity within",—"Holding, as they do, but one essence of all things, which essence is God, Pantheists must deny the existence of essential evil. All evil is negative—it is imperfection, non-growth". (p. 177, and onwards.)

It is now time that we consider the importance which Prof. Lewis attaches to the distinction between the *being* and the *becoming*, "on a religious ground". He says, p. 36,

"The highest aim of religion is to draw men to the contemplation of true being; to get them, if possible, above the sense, the temporal, and the flowing, to the unseen and the eternal".

He regards it as injurious to religion to assert that "Any thing which *is*, for the present, just as truly *is*, as that which is for eternity". He regards it as,

"a truth sure as any thing in the mathematics, that all things are flowing without intermission. Matter is a stream. There is no rest, there can be no rest in the natural"—"There is the moon-beam playing on the rippled waters. For a moment it occupies space,"—"It is like all other matter, a *doing*, a doing in space; at least, take away the doing, and nothing else, either sensible or conceivable is left"—"and yet these are no more flowing than the oak of a thousand years, or the hard boulder of the Alps,"—"no more or less *becoming* than the solid granite of the Andes."—"It could be shown mathematically, that there can be no rest in matter;"—"they are not standing *things*, but *doings* all of them,"—"they are *events* from the floating mote to the rolling world,"—"having no standing reality;"—"in this world of matter the real things that *stand*, are *forces*, *ideas*, and *laws*."

Prof. Lewis regards it as essential to the interests of religion, that we adopt the philosophic notion, not merely that the granite boulder of the Alps and the solid granite of the Andes are crumbling away, and that the pyramids are wasting, and that the mummy of three thousand years is losing its substance, but that all these have no real *being*, but are only *becoming*; the matter of the mummy and the pyramid, and the granite boulder, and the interior granite of the Andes,—is all a flowing stream of matter,—never a *real* boulder, or granite, or pyramid, or mummy, but ever one *about* to be, or *becoming* one! And this he regards as essential to religion,—that we believe even the particles of elementary substance to be a stream of matter, never *real* matter but always *becoming* so, the *doing* of a force or spirit. This, he thinks, can be mathematically demonstrated. (How fond he is of the mathematics! Would that he had favored us with the process.) Yet all our experience, science, and mathematics, are unable to show that a single particle of elementary matter has ever been in a flow, or been annihilated, or changed, or had its substance renewed, since the first creation of the world. Prof. Lewis not only finds his notion susceptible of proof by mathematics, but he professes to find it abundantly taught in the Bible. When Paul, 1, Cor. 7: 29 exhorts people by the consideration that “The time is short”, and reminds them that “The fashion of this world passeth away”, Prof. Lewis will have us understand the passage, not as referring to the close of our mortal life, and to the final passing away of all earthly things, but as urging us to consider the solemn fact that “the world itself, all that is matter for sense,”—is in a *flow*, never *being*, but always *becoming*, “passing off, evermore passing off, a stream that floweth, and standeth not”.

Is this all? What is this to one who is himself in an equal flow with the earth? when for aught that Paul urges here, the time of this flowing may not be “short,” but continue “ever more”! He cites also 1: John 2: 17. “Ο Κοσμος, the world itself, *παρayerai*, “is passing away”; meaning that the cosmos is in a *flow*, never *being* a world but perpetually *becoming* one. Just as though the apostles were exhorting men not to love the world, because the material world is a world *in a flow*; its matter “*flowing*”—“ever more passing away”! In Ps. 102: 27 where it is said of the heavens and the earth, “They shall perish but thou shalt endure.” Prof. Lewis finds instead of a final perishing of the heavens and the earth, simply such a perishing as consists in a present and continued *flowing* of the materials of the heavens and the earth. “They perish,

that is, are *continually* perishing, but Thou abidest" — They are *flowing* but Thou abidest." He says "We must give אָבִיד here this sense to make it parallel with הִצְמַח but Thou shalt *stand*, or standest" i. e. "through all cosmical change". According to this the passage does not teach that God shall remain when the earth shall be no more, but only that while the earth is *flowing*, God *stands*, and stands "through all cosmical change"! But the meaning of אָבִיד is not to *flow*, or to be in a *constant flux*, but "to perish," "to die," "to be cut off," "to be destroyed," and in Job 6: 18 when applied to the streams which lose themselves in the desert, it means, not that they are *flowing*, but as in our translation, "They go to nothing and perish". The parallelism is quite as well preserved in our common translation, while the meaning of the word is fully preserved. The permanent being of God in distinction from the flowing of the "*gliding, slipping, flowing world*" (p. 33). Prof. Lewis supposes to be vindicated by word הִצְמַח, "they are flowing, but *thou abidest*,"—"that which is now and constantly going on. The *flowing* and the *abiding*, or *standing*, are co-existent", yet in Ps. 33: 9 the same word is applied to the world when it is said, "He commanded, and it *stood fast*". So also in Ps. 148: 6 the same word is used when it is said "He also hath *established* יָצַקְתָּ them forever and ever". So also in Ps. 119: 90 "Thou hast established the earth, and אָבִיד *it abideth*." So also Eccl. 1: 4 "One generation passeth away and another generation cometh, but the earth אָבִיד *standeth forever*."

In like manner in his article of Jan. 1862, p. 160 Prof. Lewis, in order to prove "the unsubstantiality of the phenomenal" cites the passage in Ps. 39: 6 "Every man walketh in a vain show." He gives to the common Hebrew word הִלַּךְ "to go", "to walk," the meaning of "*he flitteth about*". To the expressions μη βλεπομενα of 2 Cor. 4: 18, and to οὐ βλεπομένων in Heb. 11: 1 he would have us attribute the meaning of—not "*unseen*" in the sense of *now absent*,—oh no—they are all here present!—but they are "*unseen*", as the *spiritual realities which though unseen constitute the present men and worlds*! If such criticisms were confined to the heathen classics, they might be regarded as merely pitiful; showing how far a philosophical conceit, or hobby, can unbalance the mind, and unfit it to discern the true meaning of the most ordinary language. But when one ventures to indulge himself in such criticisms on the word of God, and to corrupt that sacred fountain by foisting upon it conceits and follies to which that word is an utter stranger, then the matter becomes more serious, and

incurs for its author a responsibility which we would not bear for worlds.

We come now to the claims of the advocates of the transcendental philosophy, that their system alone recognizes the proper and peculiar functions of reason. Dr. Hickok charged upon the present writer, that,

"To him all objects are just what, and just as, the senses give to us; and all investigation of them can attain to nothing other than that which the logical faculty can make out of them."

Yet this representation was entirely wrong; for the article in question expressly affirmed the contrary, in these words,

"We fully admit that man is *rational*. He is able to discern in objects of sense more than sense reveals, and what can be yielded by no analysis of objects of sense."

The article in question then went on to specify the objects of reason, beyond all functions of sense, and beyond all deductions of experience. When the present writer afterwards, in the *Am. Theol. Review*, affirmed the same things, Prof. Lewis scouted the whole statement as incongruous and hypocritical. The words of the present writer in that article were these:

"Sense can give nothing save objects of sense. It is reason that rises to necessary principles and truths, and that discerns in objects of sense more than sense reveals."

Thereupon Prof. Lewis says:

"Sense can give nothing save objects of sense"!—"This admission sounds very well indeed."—"Again, hear how men, whose vernacular is the speech of Ashdod, can talk in the Jews' language,—“But what is meant by these fine words? Either there is no thought in them, or they furnish an entrance large enough for the whole Rational Psychology to come in”—“A reason, too, they would have”, —“Naked materialism, besides having a very unorthodox look, is at present philosophically vulgar. Such brave men as Compté, to be sure, care nothing about its vulgarity; they have no spiritism to take care of. But their orthodox co-laborers have not nerve enough for that: they would talk a little transcendentalism now and then; or to do them more justice, they have too much sincere religion, too much of the spirit of the Bible to carry it out."

It is high time that such representations and innuendos should cease: for they imply both claims and accusations that are wholly groundless and false. It is wholly untrue that the recognition of the functions of reason, above those of sense, are peculiar to, or a discovery of, the transcendental philosophy;

or that that philosophy has, in this respect, any mission to correct the common doctrines of our common philosophy. Reid distinctly and fully set forth the mental origin of axioms and necessary truths: perhaps no man has more justly distinguished between the province of sense and reason than he. The old treatises of Buffier and of Beattie, fully and ably maintained the same. Edwards (*on the Will*) (vol. 5, p. 51, *Carvill's Ed.*) recognized the distinctive faculty of reason when he said, "That whatever *begins* to be, which before was not, must have a *cause* why it then begins to exist, seems to be the *first dictate of the common and natural sense which God has implanted in the minds of all mankind.*" Here is no reference to experience, like that which bewildered Hume; but the rational origin of the doctrine of cause. Even Bacon saw the error both of the pure sensualists and of the pure rationalists; and by a happy comparison fixed the difference between them for ever. In Book I, p. 95, he compares the empirics to the *ant*, which only heaps up and uses what it finds. These are the philosophers who never rise above that which they receive through sense. The pure Rationalists he compares to the *spider*, which spins its web out of its own bowels. These are the *à priori* philosophers, who want no facts nor experience, but can give Rational Psychologies and Rational Cosmologies out of the pure reason alone; they are able to tell the Lord beforehand what sort of minds and worlds he must make, if he makes any at all, giving *à priori* Ideas of All Intelligence, and *à priori* systems of all the Cosmology which the Lord can ever undertake. The true philosophers Bacon compares to the *bee*, which gathers material from all flowers, and by a power within itself converts it into honey, which before it was not. These are they who believe in soul and body both, and use both the sense and the reason which God has given them. They do not undertake to tell *à priori* whether there *are* two straight lines, but two supposed straight lines being given or conceived, they can tell, without experience, that these cannot enclose a space. They cannot *à priori* prove that there must be a God; but given "the things that are made," they can thereupon see that these must necessarily have had a cause, who must be both designer, Creator, and moral Ruler.

Here, may the present writer be pardoned, in declaring that the distinction between the functions of sense and reason he first learned from Locke, nearly forty years ago, and before he had ever heard of the transcendental philosophy. The theory, which Locke undertook to sustain, did indeed forbid the recognition of the proper functions of reason, and could

be consistent with nothing save a sensuous philosophy. But he was led into this theory by abandoning, for the moment, the Baconian method, and by assuming, *a priori*, that the only sources of knowledge must be sensation and reflection. But reason, though driven out with a pitchfork, was ever returning; so that the readers of Locke were ever querying whether, by reflection, he did not mean something more than a mere digestion of ideas derived from sense. Reason, though often expelled, at last returned and fully asserted her dominion, in spite of Locke's transcendental assumption. In Book iv, ch. 17, § 14, his caption is, "*Our highest knowledge intuitive*". Under this he instances not only intuitions of sense but of reason also; ascribing to each "*the highest certainty*". "In this," he says, "consists the evidence of those maxims [axioms] which nobody has any doubt about, but every one—does not as is said *assent* to—but *knows* to be true, as soon as they are proposed to their understanding. In the discovery and assent to these truths, there is no need of reasoning, but they are known by a superior and higher light".

Now surely no one can suppose that Locke regarded these truths as having their origin in sense, or made up of ideas derived from sense, by compounding them, or reflecting upon them.

In his reply to Stillingfleet, he clearly asserts this domain of reason beyond every province of sense: "Reason, standing for true and clear principles, I have not wholly omitted; as is manifest from what I have said of self-evident propositions and demonstration. They are all known by their native evidence, are wholly independent, receive no light, nor are capable of proof from another."

Has any man more clearly defined the origin and character of necessary truths?

In his method of showing the existence of God, "with evidence," he says, "equal to mathematical certainty," his second proposition defines the doctrine of *cause* as an "*intuitive certainty*".

Had Locke held here, he would have modified his theory by throwing away his *a priori* transcendental assumption concerning the sources of knowledge, and returning strictly to the Baconian method, he would have struck the balance truly between pure sensualism and pure rationalism; and then the Skepticism of Hume, the Idealism of Kant, and the Atheism of Hegel, would perhaps have never been.

But Prof. Lewis holds that if we admit man to be rational, we "open an entrance wide enough for the whole Rational

Psychology to come in"! By no means. Because reason can rise above the province of sense, does it follow that reason can tell beforehand all the means and methods by which God shall be able to make minds, through sense, cognizant of external things? Because man has reason, is he therefore able to tell beforehand how largely God may see fit to extend the powers of or faculty of reason, in any case to be bestowed on angels or men? Cannot man be rational, without being able to tell beforehand how God must create matter, and without being able to describe beforehand all the cosmical arrangements of any worlds which God may be able to make? If a man is rational, does it follow that he shall be able to tell, *à priori*, of beings to be compounded of matter and spirit, who shall be led into sin by the "colliding influence" of necessitated matter over free spirit; and that, when such beings have sinned, God will become incarnate—"use sentient nature as a tabernacle for Divinity to set forth a propitiation"? All this the Rational Psychology demands that man shall be able to do, before he shall be able to find an Absolute; and he must find an Absolute in order to find that man has any reason; and he must find the reason before he can find an outer world; while, on the same system, before the finding of the world, reason can never be found, but remains a "void conception" forever: so all this beautiful system of Psychology ends in shutting men up to the dominion of unrealities and dreams:

"Altera, candenti perfecta nitens elephanto,
Sed falsa ad cœlum mittunt insomnia Manes".

If we admit that man is rational, do we thereby open an entrance large enough for the whole Rational Psychology to come in? Kant explored this field for years:—and what can he do that cometh after the King!—He explored it so thoroughly as to make it his own: and he was manifestly right when he at last declared, "*Rational Psychology*"—"is but a pretended science" [Meiklejohn's trans. p. 238] which "*has its origin in a mere misunderstanding*". (p. 249.)

Prof. Lewis complains that we test this philosophy by trying to show its consequences in the field of religion; and that we do not rather leave it as a mere speculation. But it was not in the interest of mere speculation that Dr. Hickok wrote his Psychology, but expressly for its uses in the field of religion. He declares it necessary, in many cases, to prepare the way for the Bible. And when the present writer said "For ourselves, we greatly prefer to approach any man that lives, with the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God," Dr.

Hickok responds that with the philosophy at present prevailing in the Christian world :

"No alternative is left" to the Christian teacher's "faith, but to discard philosophy".—"His position virtually is, that all religion is of God, and all reason is of the devil". (p. 223.)

And in this connection he thus refers to the words used by the present writer :

"The teacher of the coming preachers of the Gospel must have a theology rendered just so contradictory and absurd by his philosophy, and yet say that in this very way he "prefers to approach any man that lives with the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God".

Enough. Dr. Hickok shall not even so persuade us to approach any man that lives with his philosophy rather than with the Word of God. For ourselves, we have ever made it our rule to ask as simply as possible, What has God taught? and to be as careful as possible, that no philosophy of our own, or of any other man, should be allowed to come in to help decide that question. We hope to make this our rule till we die. Sooner than allow any philosophy to bear with the weight of an atom upon the simple and fair interpretation of the Word of God, we would burn all our books of philosophy, and renounce all philosophy forever. We have never had any care for philosophy, save only to beware lest any man spoil us by philosophy and vain deceit. The more purely we can send every man to the Word of God, the better: and if any man "seemeth," in respect of philosophy, "to be wise in this world", and therefore skeptical, we know nothing better for such a man than the scriptural advice; "Let him become a fool, that he may be wise".

ART. VIII.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT PHILADELPHIA.

THE General Assembly of our branch of the Presbyterian Church met at Philadelphia, in the First Presbyterian Church, Thursday May 21, and was opened with a sermon by the late Moderator, Rev. Dr. Duffield of Detroit, from the text 2 Tim. iii, 1: "This know also that in the last days perilous times shall come". The special perils that threaten the peace and prosperity of the church were forcibly described, perhaps with less hopeful views of the future than are entertained by many. The discourse, however, breathed an ardent devotion to the church of Christ, and to our country in its present conflicts. The Rev. Henry B. Smith, D.D. of New York was chosen Moderator of the Assembly. Commissioners were present from all the presbyteries excepting one in Iowa, and those in Alta California. The whole number upon the roll was 221, the largest we believe in any of our Assemblies since the separation in 1838.

And no Assembly convened during that period has been more united and harmonious. Some questions were earnestly debated, but in the most Christian spirit. No symptoms were manifest of party spirit or of divisive counsels. The spirit of God, a spirit of concord and peace, was shed in abundant measure upon all the deliberations. The spirit of Christian union was also largely enhanced. True to its traditions, the Assembly was enthusiastically loyal and patriotic, and reiterated the testimony it has so long borne in respect to the evils of slavery, and the urgent need of emancipation. The conviction was deeply felt and often expressed, that the Providence of God was affording new and constant vindication of the principles for which we have so long contended. All the great projects of our church were fully debated, and in them in all, in spite of the evils of our civil war, progress was reported. Many of the most venerated ministers of our church were in attendance, as commissioners, or to present special reports. When shall we be likely to meet again, on the floor of the same Assembly, Drs. Cox, Skinner, Barnes, Beman, Duffield, and Brainerd? Their presence, especially at the time when the delegates of the Peoria Assembly offered their fraternal salutations, impart-

ed a heightened interest to the whole occasion, and united the present with the past.

Our limits allow only an epitome of the proceedings, which were exceedingly well reported, in full, in the *American Presbyterian*, published daily during the sessions of the Assembly.

The Report on the *Church Erection Fund* was presented by Rev. Dr. J. W. McLane:

The whole number of grants made during the year is twenty-eight, of which eleven have been in loans, and seventeen in donations. In several instances the character of a grant has been changed at the earnest request of the parties, and with the concurrence and recommendation of the Synodical Committee, from a donation to a loan, and *vice versa*. The whole amount of grants made from the beginning is \$74,006; of which \$60,816 have been in loans, and \$13,390 in donations. There has been returned to the treasury on loans the sum of \$11,348.08, and upon donations \$1,526.09, making the whole amount thus returned \$12,874.17, and leaving the sum, in loans and donations now in use, of \$61,044.73. The tendency for the last few years has been toward an increase in the number of donations. The Plan of the Fund allows each Synod to grant in donations a sum equal to one fourth of the amount apportioned to it by the General Assembly. In most cases that limit has not as yet been reached.

The condition of the Church Erection Fund on May 1, 1863, was as follows:

Amount of Loans to Churches, secured by bond and mortgage.....	\$49,464 92
Amount of Donations to Churches, secured by bond and mortgage.....	11,668 16
Amount of call loans and temporary investments,..	52,000 00
Interest thereon to date.....	340 00
Amount of securities for original subscriptions estimated.....	1,000 00
Amount of cash in bank.....	4,400 96
	<hr/>
	\$118,874 04

A Committee was appointed to report to the next Assembly upon some proposed modifications of the rules, to meet the pressing wants of certain congregations in the Western States. The members of this committee are J. Few Smith, D.D., R. W. Patterson, D.D., P. H. Fowler, D.D., Hon. Wm. Strong and Oliver H. Lee.

The Report on *Education* was read by the Secretary, Rev. T. A. Mills. Its receipts showed a large increase on the amount reported last year; though the number of students is somewhat diminished by the civil war. The Philadelphia Education Society is to give place to the Permanent Committee.

"One hundred and one young men have received, directly from the treasury, assistance as follows: In Auburn Theological Seminary, 22;

Lane, 16; Union, 20. In Hamilton College, 8; Union, 3; Yale, 1; Marietta, 12; Western Reserve, 4; Wabash, 7; Knox, 3; Michigan University, 1; New York Free Academy, 1; Olivet Academy, Mich., 1. Nine others (six theological, and three collegiate and academic) received assistance from bodies which were in a transition state, but may now be fairly placed in connection with the Committee; making a total of 110.

"It is known to the Committee that some churches and benevolent individuals have aided directly one or more young men, and that a number have been placed on foundations in different institutions. Perhaps it would not vary far from the truth to say, that during the year about two hundred students have been assisted, at an outlay of something over \$20,000.

"The rate of appropriation to these students has been \$90 per annum for the theological course, and \$80 for the collegiate and academic. The rules approved by the Assembly fix the amount at \$120 for the theological course, \$100 for the collegiate, and \$80 for the academic; but these rates have never, with one single exception for one year, been paid. The Committee know that their appropriation to theological students has been supplemented from other sources, so that they have received one hundred dollars each, in addition to their own earnings.

"From the Treasurer's accounts it will be seen that he has received from 311 churches, 44 individual contributors, and some other miscellaneous sources, \$15,271.77, and that the expenditures of the Committee for all purposes have been \$13,668.64, leaving a balance of \$1603.13."

In the subsequent debate, the condition of Auburn Seminary was stated more at length by Dr. Fowler; that of Lane by Prof. Day; and that of Union by Dr. Skinner. Deserved tributes were paid by the latter, and by Dr. Cox, to the memory of Dr. Edward Robinson. The Assembly's Standing Committee, through its chairman, Prof. Day, urged increased attention to the whole subject of education, by ministers and presbyteries.

Home Missions. The annual Report was read by Dr. Kendall. It appropriately noticed the decease and services of the Associate Secretary, Rev. Benj. J. Wallace, D.D.

"The correspondence with the American Home Missionary Society was read. It appears that more than \$30,000 has been paid into the Treasury of that Society during the year, every dollar of which is withheld from the feeble Presbyterian churches in the land.

"Two hundred and fifty-six missionaries have been employed the whole or a part of the year past, performing an aggregate of 192 years' labor. The Gospel has been regularly preached in more than 360 places; 225 missionaries have forwarded statistical reports, from which it appears that there have been 843 hopeful conversions; 697 have united with the churches on profession of faith, and 668 by letter; 14 revivals are reported, 12 churches have been organized, 5 have become self sustaining, and 32 church edifices have been built, repaired or relieved of debt.

"The receipts of the year reach almost \$52,000 and yet more than 800 churches of the whole number, 4,166, have contributed nothing. But the missionaries have been paid, and no church asking aid, and well approved, has been refused."

This report shows a decided advance upon the receipts of

last year, which amounted to about \$20,000. The annual sermon was preached by Rev. Z. M. Humphrey of Chicago, who exhibited the claims of our country in an able and effective manner. The Standing Committee of the Assembly, through their Chairman, the Rev. Dr. Clarke of Buffalo, presented an able document, reviewing our home missionary work, and our relations to the Home Missionary Society, and commending the whole subject anew to the prayers and zeal of the churches.

The subject of *Foreign Missions* was fully handled in the Report of our Permanent Committee, Asa D. Smith, D.D. Chairman, and W. S. Griffith, Secretary. The Assembly acts in continued harmony with the American Board, under which we have 63 missionaries and secretaries. The amount of our contributions is \$69,482, in a membership of 135,454. The Report says:

"Of the 1,466 churches, only 595 contributed any thing.

"It thus appears that our rolls show an army of 135,454, bound by sacramental pledge and by every obligation of love and duty to devote their hearts and lives, every power mortal and immortal to honor the King of Zion, and to build up his kingdom; that this great army, enjoying the Gospel themselves and living in the midst of plenty which God has showered down upon them, have actually contributed to send the Word of Life to the perishing heathen during a whole year, only the sum of \$69,482.68, or an average of about 51 cents to each enrolled member, which is less than one cent per week."

The Assembly's Standing Committee responded through their Chairman, Rev. Albert Barnes, and the following among other Resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That this General Assembly and the churches we represent are called upon to cherish and manifest the deepest interest in the work of Foreign Missions, as conducted by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, with which we have been so long and so happily connected, and which has given us such abundant proofs of the skill and fidelity which have marked the management of its great trust, and of the entire fairness of all its arrangements relating to the location of the missionaries connected with our Presbyteries, and their freedom to act according to the dictates of their own judgment as to the formation of Presbyteries in their respective fields.

Resolved, That it be recommended to the Presbyteries that they appoint one of their ministers or elders as the Presbyterial agent for Foreign Missions, whose duty it shall be to see that the cause is presented to each church, to report at each meeting of the Presbytery, and also to report annually to the Permanent Committee of the Assembly, what each church in the Presbytery has done for the cause during the year, and that the stated clerk of each Presbytery be requested to furnish to the Permanent Committee the name of the minister or elder who shall be appointed the Presbyterial agent for Foreign Missions.

A Special Report on proposed missions in Central and South America was read by Dr. Duffield. At present there is not much opening for such a work; but there may be ere long; and it is upon a field not occupied by the American Board.

The Report on *Publication* by Rev. John W. Dulles stated that the sum received from contributions during the past year was only \$4,212; from sales \$12,221. It was felt by the Assembly that this part of our work needs to be prosecuted with much greater liberality. A long and able Report, traversing the whole subject, was read by Dr. Beman, and resulted in passing a resolution to endeavor to raise \$50,000 for this object.

One of the most interesting debates in the Assembly was called forth by the Resolutions upon the state of the country, offered by Mr. Barnes, as chairman of a Special Committee on this subject. There was no real difference of opinion on the principles involved; the Assembly was unanimous in its loyalty, in its unconditional support of the Government, and in the view that, as slavery is the cause of the war, so the war to be successful, must end in giving the death-blow to slavery. Still there was some debate as to phraseology, and criticism of minor points. Dr. Spear proposed substitutes for several of the Resolutions; but they were passed in substance as originally reported. We should be glad to give them in full, did our space permit. Some of the most important are the following:

"2. That in explanation of our views, and as a further and solemn expression of the sentiments of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in regard to the duty of those whom we represent, and of all the American people at the present time, we now declare,

"First, That civil government is ordained of God, and that submission to a lawful government, and to its acts in its proper sphere, is a duty binding on the conscience and required by all the principles of our religion, as a part of our allegiance to God.

Second, That while there is in certain respects a ground of distinction between a *government* considered as referring to the constitution of a country, and an *administration*, considered as referring to the existing agencies, through which the principles and provisions of the constitution are administered; yet, the government of a country to which direct allegiance and loyalty are due at any time, is the administration duly placed in power. Such an administration is the government of a nation, having a right to execute the laws and demand the entire, unqualified and prompt obedience of all who are under its authority; and resistance to such a government is rebellion and treason.

"Third, That the present administration of the United States, duly elected under the Constitution, is the government in the land to which alone under God, all the citizens of this nation owe allegiance; who, as such, are to be honored and obeyed; whose efforts to defend the government against re-

bellion are to be sustained; and that all attempts to resist or set aside the action of the lawfully constituted authorities of the government in any way by speech or action, to oppose or embarrass the measures which it may adopt to assert its lawful authority, except in accordance with the forms prescribed by the Constitution, are to be regarded as treason against the nation—as giving aid and comfort to its enemies, and as rebellion against God.

“4. That the Government of these United States as provided for by the Constitution, is not only founded upon the great doctrine of human rights as vested by God in the individual man, but is also expressly declared to be the supreme civil authority in the land, forever excluding the modern doctrine of secession as a civil or political right; that since the existing rebellion finds no justification in the facts of the case or the Constitution of the United States—in any law human or divine—the Assembly can regard it only as treason against the nation, and a most offensive sin in the sight of God, justly exposing its authors to the retributive vengeance of earth and heaven; that this rebellion, in its origin, history, and measures, has been distinguished by those qualities which most sadly evince the depravity of our nature, especially in seeking to establish a new nationality on this continent, based on the perpetual enslavement and oppression of a weak and long-injured race; that the National forces are, in the view of this Assembly, called out not to wage war against another government, but to suppress insurrection, preserve the supremacy of law and order, and save the country from anarchy and ruin.

“6. That the system of human bondage as existing in the Slaveholding States, so palpably the root and cause of this whole insurrectionary movement, is not only a violation of the dearest rights of human nature, but essentially hostile to the letter and spirit of the Christian religion; that the evil character and demoralizing tendencies of this system so properly described and justly condemned by the General Assembly of our church, especially from 1818 to the present time, have been placed in the broad light of day by the history of this existing rebellion; that in the sacrifices and desolations, the cost of treasury and blood caused thereby, the Assembly recognize the chastening hand of God, applied to the punishment of national sins, especially the sin of slavery; that in the Proclamation of Emancipation issued by the President as a war measure, and submitted by him to the considerate judgment of mankind, the Assembly recognize with devout gratitude that wonder-working providence of God, by which military necessities become the instrument of justice in breaking the yoke of oppression and causing the oppressed to go free; and further, that the Assembly beseech Almighty God in his own time to remove the last vestige of slavery from this country, and give to the nation preserved, disciplined, and purified, a peace that shall be based on the principles of eternal righteousness.”

The other resolutions expressed the duty of sustaining the government; rebuked secession, and all complicity therewith; exhibited; exhorted the church to do its whole duty; and expressed sympathy for the bereaved. The document was subsequently handed to the President of the United States by a large Committee of the Assembly, who were courteously welcomed.

The reception of delegates and commissioners from other denominations claimed a considerable share of the time, and en-

grossed the interest of the Assembly. Only one delegate was present from New England, the Rev. A. Hyde of Vermont, who made a fraternal address. Dr. Wylie of the Reformed Presbyterians offered the Christian salutations of his church, which were cordially reciprocated by Rev. A. Barnes. Communications were read from our delegates to other ecclesiastical bodies. But the highest interest was awakened by the initiation of a correspondence with the General Assembly in session at Peoria.

That Assembly met last year at Columbus in Ohio, and there made proposals for fraternal communion, which, however did not reach the Moderator of our Assembly, Dr. Duffield, until after its adjournment. The papers were communicated to the Assembly at Philadelphia on the first day of its session. The letter of Dr. Beatty, Moderator of the Columbus Assembly, inclosed the following minute:

"In the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, in session at Columbus, Ohio, the matter of a fraternal correspondence, by Commissioners, with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (N. S.), in session at Cincinnati, Ohio, being duly considered, is decided as follows:

"This Assembly having considered several overtures sent to it by a few of the Presbyteries under its care, proposing that steps should be taken by it towards an organic union between this Church and the Church under the care of the Presbyterian General Assembly (N. S.); and having determined against the course proposed in said overtures, has also been informed that the other General Assembly has, about the same time, come to a similar conclusion on similar overtures laid before it by a certain number of its own Presbyteries. Of its own motion, this General Assembly, considering the time to have come for it to take the initiative in securing a better understanding of the relations which it judges are proper to be maintained between the two General Assemblies, "hereby proposes, that there shall be a stated annual and friendly interchange of Commissioners between the two General Assemblies," each body sending to the other one minister and one ruling elder, as Commissioners, year by year; the said Commissioners to enjoy such privileges in each body to which they are sent as are common to all those now received by this body from other Christian denominations. The Moderator will communicate this deliverance to the Moderator of the other Assembly, to be laid before it, with our Christian salutations."

As soon as the documents were brought before the Assembly, a Special Committee was appointed to report upon them, consisting of Drs. Spear, Cox, Gridley, and Messrs. W. A. Booth and C. N. Olds; and at their suggestion, the following Resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"The Committee to whom was referred a communication from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, that met at Columbus, Ohio, May, 1862, addressed to this General Assembly, and proposing 'a stated, annual and friendly interchange of Commissioners between

the two General Assemblies,' recommend the adoption of the following resolutions by this Assembly:

"1. *Resolved*, That this Assembly, with heartfelt pleasure and Christian salutation, accept the proposition thus made, hoping and praying that it may result in securing a better understanding of the relations, which, in the judgment of this Assembly, are proper to be maintained between the two Assemblies.

"2. *Resolved*, That, in accordance with the suggestion of the Moderator of the last Assembly, meeting in Columbus, that this interchange of Commissioners should commence at the earliest practicable period, Rev. R. W. Patterson, D.D., and Hon. Wm. H. Brown be appointed as Commissioners to represent this Assembly in the General Assembly now holding its session at Peoria, Illinois.

"3. *Resolved*, That it be suggested that future Assemblies of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church in these United States, hereafter designate each other respectively by the places in which their sessions are appointed to be held.

"4. *Resolved*, That a certified copy of this action be transmitted to the Moderator of the General Assembly now holding its sessions at Peoria, Illinois, and that the Commissioners be requested to repair to that body, and express to it the fraternal and Christian regards of this General Assembly."

The Peoria Assembly at once responded by appointing Dr. Tustin (who drew up the above minute last year) and Hon. G. Sharswood as principals, and Dr. Hall and J. W. Harper, Esq., as alternates. The time for receiving them was appointed on Tuesday afternoon, May 26, when a large and deeply moved congregation gathered together in the old and honored church, where, a quarter of a century ago, the rupture of these two denominations was effected. Many who bore a part in that momentous struggle were witnesses of this more hallowed revival of a spirit of fraternal confidence and affection. Dr. Tustin delivered a most cordial and eloquent address, touching the deepest sympathies of his eager and hushed audience, as with tremulous voice he spoke words of love and peace. The past was forgotten, and hearts were melted in unison. Nor could the applause be restrained when he announced in frank terms that "so far as we are concerned the strife is at an end". "I come to you bearing aloft the trophies of fraternal love and affection—for love has its triumphs as well as hate—peace as well as war. I come to invite you back to confidence and esteem". The Moderator of the Assembly, in a cordial response, reciprocated the heartfelt expressions of Christian affection; reviewed some of the events that marked the separation; and spoke of the long slumbering desire for such brotherly interchange of Christian feelings. Those that have the same faith, the same polity, the same aims, and the same divine Head, are separated only for a time. Both of these great branches of the Presbyterian church have the same ancestry and the same history; they rehearse

their faith in the words of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms. Both adopt the Pauline, the Augustinian and the Reformed creed, in contrast with Pelagianism, Socinianism and Arminianism. Both are devoted to our national cause with unswerving loyalty: both share in sympathies and prayers for that ill-fated race, whose oppression lies so deep among our nation's sins, and whose deliverance and elevation are necessary to secure the peace and unity of our Republic. United now in expressions of mutual confidence and love, we seek not to cast the horoscope of the future. Each branch of the church has its providential work; for a more complete reunion we await the guidance of Divine Providence. This impressive scene was concluded by the singing of the hymn "Blest be the tie that binds", and prayer by the Rev. Dr. Cox.

The action of both Assemblies is restricted to the interchange of commissioners. No projects for organic reunion have yet been definitely discussed. Enough for the present hour, that the bitterness and controversies of the past are deplored; and that a spirit of Christian fellowship has been poured upon the heart of our churches. The Cincinnati Assembly of last year, in reply to some overtures on this subject, "*Resolved*, That while we bear in mind the prayer of our Lord that his disciples may be one, and while we can see some special advantages to be derived from a reunion of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church, we do not perceive that, beyond the previous declaration of our views, any thing remains for us, at the present, but to await humbly and teachably the movements of Divine Providence". A premature pressure of the question would be unwise. The country is passing through great changes, the results of which no human vision can foresee, and which may settle some necessary preliminary questions. No action upon this subject was taken this year by the Philadelphia Assembly. The Peoria Assembly, in reply to several overtures, passed the following minute, to which we cordially assent:

The Committee on the union between the Old and New School Churches reported as follows:

"The Committee to whom was referred the memorial from the Presbytery of Chippewa and Overture No. 1, respecting the union of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church, called the Old and New School, report that they have endeavored to consider the subject in that careful and serious manner which its importance demands, and would submit to the Assembly for their consideration and adoption the following resolutions, viz.:

"*Resolved*, 1. That, in the judgment of this General Assembly, it is not deemed expedient to take, at this time, any decided action with reference to a reunion of the New and Old School Presbyterian churches.

Resolved, 2. That in the fraternal correspondence now happily inaugurated, the General Assembly would recognize an initiative in the securing a better understanding of the relations which subsist between the two Assemblies, and the means of promoting that mutual charity and that just apprehension of the true grounds of Christian union and fellowship, which may serve to prepare the way for a union that shall be harmonious, and permanently promotive of the interests of truth and vital godliness.

Resolved, 3. That as a still further preparative to such a desirable union, the General Assembly deem it important—and this in reference to both these branches of the Presbyterian Church—that the ministers and ruling elders, and such as have the care and instruction of the young, be increasingly careful to exhibit clearly the distinctive principles of Christian doctrine and sound polity as held by the Presbyterian Church; that the ministers of these two branches of the church cultivate fraternal intercourse and interchange of views and feelings; and in all suitable ways encourage and aid one another in the appropriate work of the ministry; and that the members of the one or the other branch connect themselves with existing congregations of either, rather than cast in their influence and their aid with bodies whose principles and form of government are foreign to their own."

The proposed correspondence with the Reformed Dutch Church also elicited an animated debate. The General Synod of that church last year initiated this matter by the following action:

Whereas, This Synod considers the interchange of Christian courtesy and kindness between ecclesiastical bodies as most desirable, wherever it can be practicable and hearty; even where differences of doctrinal views may preclude that form of correspondence contemplated in Chap. 2, Art. 5, Sec. 2, of our Constitution,

Resolved, That the Synod send to the next New School General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, a Commissioner, whose office it shall be to assure that body of our fraternal affection and interest, and to propose to it a yearly interchange of kind expressions by letter."

The Rev. Hervey D. Ganse, of New York, the appointed delegate, in an able and eloquent speech, explained the action they had taken, to free it from technical difficulties. The allusion to "differences in doctrinal views" he interpreted as not intended to cast any reproach on our orthodoxy, but simply to indicate that we were supposed not to agree with them on all theological topics, they holding to the articles of the Synod of Dort in a more literal interpretation. The Assembly, after a long debate, adopted with amendments, the report of Dr. Cox on the subject, as follows:

"The Assembly, after considering the kind and earnest address of Rev. Mr. Ganse, and considering also the printed Minutes of the acts and proceedings of said General Synod (see pages 131 to 140, inclusive, especially the resolution and its preamble, page 140), feel with Christian and catholic regret, constrained in righteousness and truth, to decline

the special overture now made to us; but we hereby cordially offer correspondence with them on the same terms on which we correspond with other ecclesiastical bodies, and we appoint ——— a commissioner to attend the next meeting of their General Synod."

Under this resolution, Dr. Skinner was appointed the delegate to the Reformed Dutch Synod.

It gives us great pleasure to add that our delegate was most cordially received by that Synod, which met at Newburgh, June 3d, and a resolution formally to inaugurate a correspondence with our Assembly, and to appoint a delegate to attend the next meeting of the body, was unanimously adopted. We cannot refrain from giving the brief report of our excellent delegate in his own words, in order to show the spirit in which the act was done:

"My cup of pleasure has been overflowing since I left the Synod. They received me as if I had been, not a delegate from our Assembly, but an angel of the Lord. Their response to my address, through their noble President, was entirely cordial and magnanimous. Very promptly and magnanimously they accepted our overtures, and resolved at once to appoint a delegate to attend our next Assembly. So far as I know, there has been no parallel to the heavenly emotion which marked this consummation of proposal for correspondence, except that ever memorable one, which occurred in Philadelphia week before last."

Various other matters of importance, to which we can only allude, were brought before the Assembly. There was only one judicial case, that of S. Edwards Todd, on appeal from the decision of the Presbytery of Cayuga. This was finally remanded to the Synod of Onondaga and the Presbytery of Cayuga for revision. Resolutions approving the work of the New York Sabbath Committee were passed, after hearing an address from Rev. R. S. Cook. The American Sunday-School Society was commended anew. On motion of Dr. Darling, the AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW was recommended to our ministers and churches. A committee was appointed (Dr. Asa D. Smith, chairman) to report to the next Assembly on the subject of manse and parochial libraries. The whole question of Sabbath-schools, and their relation to the church, and of Sunday services, is also to be reported upon by a committee, of which Dr. Joel Parker is the chairman. It was brought up in various forms, among others by an overture from the Presbytery of Genesee, to which Dr. Skinner, in behalf of the Committee of Bills and Overtures, replied, in part, as follows:

"The Sunday-school, like all the religious institutions and agencies of each individual church, is and ought to be under the watch and care of the Session, and should be regarded not as superseding, but as coöperating with the entire system of pastoral instruction, the responsibility of which it should not in any manner diminish.

"There is nothing in our constitution which prescribes the number of public services to be held on the Lord's Day, or which restrains any church from appropriating to the Sunday-school such a portion of the day as may seem to it desirable.

"The peculiar position of baptized children as members of the church, to be as members trained in all Christian virtues and duties, is so expressly set forth in our standards, that no revision of them could present it with greater clearness, or in a more authoritative form. See Confession, chap. xxv, sec. 2; Larger Catechism, Question 166; Form of Government, chap. ii, secs. 2, 4; Book of Discipline, chap. i, sec. 6; Directory for Worship, chap. ix, sec. 1-3."

The annual Historical Discourse was delivered by Rev. Dr. Fisher, President of Hamilton College. It was an able and eloquent account of what Presbyterians have done for the promotion of education in our country.

The Narrative on the State of Religion was read by Rev. John Crowell, and showed that there has been spiritual growth in our churches, in the midst of all the calamities of our civil war. The names of the ministers deceased during the year will be given under another head.

The Assembly was dissolved on Monday evening, June 1, after uniting in the monthly concert for prayer. Appropriate resolutions and addresses testified to the large hospitality extended to the commissioners by the citizens of Philadelphia. The next meeting is to be in Dayton, Ohio. Taken as a whole, this last session of our Assembly has been most cheering and satisfactory. As Mr. Barnes so fitly said in his closing remarks: "I think there is advancement: I think there has been an intensity of interest, a depth of feeling, an attachment to the church and the great interests in which we are engaged, a devotion to our country, such as will give this Assembly a marked place in the history of our church and of our nation."

ART. IX.—THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Archæological Institute.—At a late meeting of this body, Mr. Birch, Keeper of Antiquities in the British Museum, gave an interesting lecture on the gold jewelled ornaments discovered in Egypt and sent by the Viceroy to the late International Exhibition, where they had been inspected with eager curiosity. They were found near Thebes, in 1859, by M. Mariette, Director of the Viceroy's Museum, and were brought to England under his charge. The sepulchre in which their discovery was made has been attributed to the Queen Aah Holep, mother of Amosis I, of the seventeenth dynasty—one of the most remarkable personages in early Egyptian history. After a most interesting sketch of the condition of public affairs at the period, and the determined conflicts with the Shepherds, invaders from the East, who assumed powerful hostile dominion in Egypt, Mr. Birch entered upon a minute description of the rich ornaments, aided by an exquisite series of drawings. From the great richness of the coloring, it had been supposed that some portions of these precious relics had been enamelled, but this notion Mr. Birch believed to be erroneous; he had seen no example of true enamelling on Egyptian works. In conclusion, he stated that the date of these objects may be placed, at the lowest calculation, at B.C. 1500 or 1510; but they are possibly even of a higher antiquity. Mr. Yates pointed out analogies presented by these insignia of an ancient Egyptian sovereign, with other ancient evidence; and Mr. Franks stated his concurrence in the view taken by Mr. Birch regarding the lack of proof that enamel was known to the ancient Egyptians.

The *Revue de l'Instruction Publique* announces important discoveries made by Volgué and Waddington in Syria, in a region called Safa, inhabited by fierce Bedouins, never before penetrated, excepting in part by Wetzstein and Graham. They found a large series of inscriptions, in mixed characters (Greek, Semitic, and a new alphabet), supposed to give the state of the language of the region about the time of Christ. A temple is still standing of the time of the Agrippas with an inscription in honor of Herod. A gap in the history of architecture is also supposed to be filled by edifices ranging from the 3d to the 6th century of the Christian era—particularly in respect to the origin of the cupola. Round and polygonal churches were also found—resembling the mosque of St. Sophia, etc.

In speaking of the restorations now made at Rome by order of the Emperor Louis Napoleon, the *Correspondence of Rome*, referring to the Triumphal Arch of Constantine, says that "at the time it was raised Rome was not yet Christian, but that the miracle of the Labarum was so striking that the Roman Senate could only see the finger of God in the victories of the son of Helena, and caused to be engraved on the two sides of the monument that this victory was *INSTINCTU DIVINITATIS*". Unfortunately, the researches of archæologists have demonstrated that these words are of later origin; that the original inscription was the Pagan formula, *NUTU JOVIS. O. M. (nutu Jovis optimi maximi)*, which has been replaced by the *instinctu divinitatis*, traces of the old words, however, still remaining distinct. This is shown by the German epigraphist, M. G. Henzen, in the supplement to *Orelli's Collection of Inscriptions*; and it also rests on the testimony of Borghesi and other Roman archæologists, who examined it with care about forty years ago.—*La Correspondance Littéraire*.

The French Academy of Inscriptions has awarded to M. Alexandre Bertrand, formerly member of the French School of Athens, the prize for the best essay on the discoveries since the beginning of the present century in relation to Celtic monuments. Four essays were sent in. M. Bertrand shows that the monuments of this kind in France become more numerous as the northwest and west coasts are approached. It is inferred that they are due to a littoral population which penetrated towards the interior, following the principal rivers and their affluents. He considers that the "dolmena" are sepulchral monuments, and believes that their origin must be referred to a period anterior to the invasion of the Celts.

Mr. Henry Stevens has published, in 2 vols., \$8, his *Historical Nuggets*, an account of his own collection of rare books relating to America—a very valuable work. Only 100 copies are printed. It comprises 3,000 titles.

The Imperial Library of St. Petersburg has purchased the celebrated collection of Hebrew and Caraitic manuscripts formed by M. Firkovitch, a Caraitic himself, who is well known for his scientific zeal, and who, during thirty years in his numerous travels in Palestine, the Caucasus, and at Constantinople, had collected the memorials of Jewish antiquity wherever he could find them. The collection consists of 47 manuscript rolls of the Pentateuch, 77 collections of the Old Testament, 23 translations in Eastern languages, 272 Caraitic and 523 Rabbinist works, 550 historical letters or documents, 722 funeral inscriptions, and 300 plans of the ancient fortresses of New Russia. It also contains 124 authentic manuscripts of the Old Testament, of which 21 are anterior to the ninth century. According to the opinions of Tischendorf, Dora, Bekker, and others, no European library possesses Hebraic manuscripts of so early a date, and consequently cannot furnish such rich materials for the complete study of the text of the Old Testament. A detailed history of the collection is in progress.

ITALY.

C. Cantu, so widely known by his *Universal History* (of which 18,000 copies have been sold in Italy, and three large French editions), has recently published an interesting work on *Erasmus and the Reform in Italy*: E. was in Italy for some time from 1506, and mingled with the literary men of Turin, Bologna, Padua, Venice and Rome.

Farini in 1859 appointed a commission to search out mss. of the 12th, 13th, and 14th centuries; two volumes have been published containing a *Legend of Jean de Procida*, a *Journey to Jerusalem of Nicholas d'Este*, a *Legend of a Journey of Three Monks to the Terrestrial Paradise*—all chiefly valuable as illustrative of the language and style of the period. The apocryphal *Correspondence of Seneca and St. Paul*, written by the Florentine Lancia is another fruit of these researches.

Sciopis has written a work on the *French Domination in Italy under Napoleon I*, which is exciting much attention.

Alois Prinzivalli, *Resolutiones seu Decreta authentica sacre Congregationis Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis prepositae ab anno 1668 ad annum 1861, accurate collecta*. Rome. 1862. 8vo, viii, 855 pp.

V. Coco, *History of the Revolution in Naples*, 1799, and a *Life of the Author*, by Mariano d'Ayala. Naples. 1861.

The second and third volumes of Aug. Theiner's large work in defence of the temporal power of the Papacy have been published at Rome (*Codex diplomaticus Dominii temporalis S. Sedis*), comprising the period from 1335 to 1793; fol. Each volume costs fifteen dollars.

The first volume of the Chevalier de Rossi's *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae septimo Saeculo Antiquiores*, is published at \$36. The work will contain 11,000 inscriptions with fac similes.

Two new publications have been added to the *Index Expurgatorius* by the committee at Rome. The one is the work on Sorcery by M. Michelet, the other the newspaper published at Turin by Father Passaglia, called the *Pace*.

SWITZERLAND.

Professor Cellier, of Geneva, died Nov. 17, aged 77 years. He taught in the oriental languages, and the introduction to the Scriptures, on which latter subject he published a volume in 1853.

M. F. Hensler, of Basle, recently deceased, bequeathed 740,000 francs to the University, hospital, orphan-house, and various benevolent associations (35 in all) in France and Switzerland.

SPAIN.

A Church History of Spain for the first Three Centuries has been published at Ratisbon, written by Pius Bonifacius Gams, pp. 422. It is to be continued.

Juan Manuel Orti y Lara, *El Racionalismo y la Humildad*. Madrid, 1862. pp. 420. Manuel Angelon, *History of Isabella II. Queen of Spain*. 4to. Barcelona, 1860-1. 600 pp. with 16 plates. A. Blanch, *History of Catalonia*. 2 vols. 64 plates. Ant. Cavanilles, *History of Spain*. 3 vols. 4to. Madrid. José Maria Escandon, *History of Asturia*. 4to. Madrid, 1862. pp. 576. Garcia del Canto, *España en la Oceanía*. 8vo. Madrid, 1862. De Pidal, *History of Aragon in the Reign of Philip II*. 2, 4to. 1862.

For the first time a general statistical review of the population of Spain has been published. The number of births in the past year was 571,886; of deaths, 432,067; of marriages, 120,893. The statistics published by the "Revista-General de Estadística", singularly enough, fail to give the total of the population; only recording one birth in twenty-seven inhabitants, one death in thirty-three, one marriage in 129, according to which the total of inhabitants would be 15,500,000. The proportion of illegitimate to legitimate children in the country and smaller towns is one in twenty-seven; in the provincial capitals one in thirty-three.

PORTUGAL.

M. LUIZ REBELLO DA SILVA, a member of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Lisbon, has written a History of Portugal in the 17th and 18th centuries, in two volumes, which is spoken of as a work of unusual merit.

HOLLAND.

The Society of the Hague for the Defence of the Christian Religion, proposes a prize for the following subject: A Criticism of all the passages of Scripture that refer to Slavery, and an examination of the question, how Slavery must be regarded from the Christian point of view. This is to in-

clude an examination of the most important recent works on the subject, including those published in America. The prize is 400 guilders; the time till March 15, 1864. Other subjects are: The Idea of the Messiah; the Union of Faith in the Divine Origin of the Gospels, with the results of historical criticism.

The Teyler Society of Haarlem offers a prize of 400 guilders for the best Essay on the Influence of the Empirical Philosophy in France, Germany, and England. It may be written in Dutch, Latin, French, English or German. The limit is Jan. 1, 1864.

Heinrich Egbert Vinke died last year (Aug. 27) at Utrecht, where he had long been a distinguished Professor. His successor is Van Osterzee, one of the contributors to Lange's Bible Work, and author of a Christology. His inaugural address, Jan. 30, on Modern Scepticism, was heard with deep interest. Dr. Doedes has been appointed to the chair of Biblical Literature.

A Dutch translation of Schelling's *Philosophy of Revelation* is in progress by A. Van der Linde. The first volume is published.

J. P. N. Land has published the first volume of *Anecdota Syriaca*, with notes. 4to, pp. xvi, 215, 28 Tables and 77 pages of Syriac text.

A Dutch translation of a selection of Burns's poems has appeared at Brussels, under the title "De schoonste Liederen van Robert Burns uit het Schottisch vertaalt door Frans de Coort," accompanied by a sketch of the poet's life.

GERMANY.

Rudolf Stier, the author of the *Words of Christ*, which are now in the course of republication in this country, died Dec. 19, 1862. He was born at Fraustadt, Mar. 17, 1800, studied at Berlin and Halle, 1815-19. At first he was sceptically inclined; but the study of the Bible, with the aid of Bengel's Gnomon, brought him to decisive faith. In 1821-3, on Neander's recommendation, he taught in the Preachers' Seminary at Wittenberg, in conjunction with Nitzsch and Heubner. His first wife was a sister of Nitzsch. For four years he was a professor in the missionary Seminary at Basle; then pastor at Frankleben. He worked in unison with Tholuck, Von Gerlach, and men of kindred views, and was noted as a bold preacher. In Wichlinghausen and Skenditz he was superintendent. Among his numerous works are Biblical Preaching, 1830; Grammar of Hebrew, 1833; Seventy Select Psalms; Need of Hymn Books; Polyglott Bible, with Theile; Words of the Lord Jesus; Commentaries on the Ephesians, Jude, Proverbs, the second part of Isaiah; Privat-Agenda; Sermons; Words of the Lord from Heaven; Words of the Angels. He was preparing a work on the Prophecies of the Old Testament, and also one on Job, neither completed. He also wrote several treatises on the need of a revision of Luther's translation; and in 1836 published a translation on the basis of Luther and von Meyer. He was a warm friend of the Union of the Confessions. He likewise zealously defended the retaining of the Apocrypha in the common versions. A volume of his poems appeared in 1825, and another in 1845.

The Jerusalem Talmud is to be published at Krotoschin in Prussia, in some 15 parts at half a dollar each. Only two complete editions have been issued: at Venice, 1523, without a commentary; and at Cracow in 1604, incorrectly printed. A glossary will be appended.

The *Zeitschrift f. d. historische Theologie*, second number, 1863, has a continuation of Hochhuth's learned account of the Weigelians and Rosicrucians of the 17th century in the Hesse church: a History of the Moravians

in Livonia by Dr. J. C. M. Laurent: and a documentary account by F. Winter, of the Church Visitation in the Wittenberg district, 1528, which did so much to establish the Reformation.

The *Studien und Kritiken*, Heft 2, 1863. Sack, Character of the Heidelberg Catechism: an excellent comparative summary. This is to be followed by an article of Ullmann on the same subject. Richter, the Essence of the Lord's Supper, confined to the Biblical view, and agreeing with the Reformed positions. Schreiber on the Gregorius of Hartmann Von Aue—a poem of the 13th century, highly praised by Gervinus. Godet on the Depths of the Book of Job, an analysis of the argument. Kirchner on the Eschatology of Irenaeus—a careful and useful study. Riggenbach on the Ark of the Covenant—the main points of his recent work, noticed by himself. Wuttke's System of Christian Ethics, reviewed by Fr. Nitzsch, and noted as a vigorous attempt to construct ethics scientifically on the basis of the Lutheran orthodoxy.

Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, Heft 1, 1863. Löwe on the Results of Recent Investigations upon the Trinity: the amount is, that God is essentially *love*, and as such self-communicating; and that the eternal distinction of Father and Son is to be viewed in this aspect and relation. Frommann on "the creature" in Rom. viii, 19-23: the creature here means the human race. Zöckler, Unity of the Race; an able defence, coinciding with Quatrefages. Steitz on Auricular Confession in the primitive church, showing that it was not practised. The author has written an elaborate work on the whole Discipline of primitive times.

Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift. (The German Quarterly for English Theological Research and Criticism.) Nos. 3 and 4. 1862. Edited by Dr. M. Heidenheim in London. The numbers of this new periodical appear somewhat irregularly, the 3d bearing date Jan., and the 4th Sept., 1862. Its chief value is in giving the results of Dr. Heidenheim's Samaritan researches: the present number containing some eight articles from his pen, on different codices, inscriptions, and fragments in the British Museum. One of these is a codex of the Prophets, written between the 6th and 8th centuries. Dr. E. Hincks contributes a valuable version of an inscription on Sennacherib and Hezekiah. Canon Stanley's Introductory Lectures on Church History are given in a German version. Dr. Julius Hamberger presents a concise summary of the main points in Schelling's Philosophy of Mythology and of Revelation. Reviews of recent English theological works are also given. Dr. Heidenheim gives a short notice of visits to the libraries in Rome. One inscription in the Vatican, of the time of the Second Temple, he thinks he has succeeded in deciphering, though it has baffled all previous explorers. In the Barberini library he found a ms. which he thinks the oldest extant, viz. from the year of the world 4418—it is a kabbalistic work. He also found in the Vatican a Rabbinic Hebrew ms. of the Gospels, of which he promises further accounts.

Zeitschrift für die lutherische Theologie, No. 2, 1863. The first short article by Delitzsch is on a certain Theodore, called Hagiopetrite, whose name is found on some seven of the minuscule manuscripts of the New Test., who has usually been supposed to be a monk of Mount Athos. Delitzsch identifies this Hagios Petros as a village in Cynuria, and Theodore as living there in the 13th or 14th century. Delitzsch also contributes an instructive article on the doctrine of the Logos in Philo and John, which will appear in a future number of our REVIEW. H. O. Köhler reviews Hugo Lämmer's *Analecta Romana*, exposing the great change which two years wrought in the opinions of Lämmer, on a great variety of historical and theological topics, after his conversion to Romanism. The interesting

series of letters from Rudelbach, chiefly relating to the Lutheran Journal, is continued.

Zeitschrift für die wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1863. *Erstes Heft*. Hilgenfeld on the Theology of the Nineteenth Century describes, sharply, the three tendencies, moral, speculative, and mystic (Schleiermacher) of the later theology—partly reviewing Baur's Church History of XIX Century. A. Merx, Critical Investigation of the Laws of Sacrifice, Levit. i-vii. D. F. Strauss (author of the Life of Christ) on Christ's lamentation over Jerusalem, and the Wisdom of God as cited in Luke xi, 49. This Wisdom he conjectures to be an apocryphal book, written about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. Ewald puts it in the 5th century before Christ—so diverging are the results of "the higher criticism". Zeller on James i, 12. Hilgenfeld on the theology of John, with respect to Weiss's recent work.

Dr. J. Petzholdt, the bibliographer, has been preparing for seven years a *Bibliotheca Bibliographica*, with critical comments. The printing of the work is begun.

Dr. J. Kelle, of Prague, will soon publish the first volume of his *Comparative Grammar* of the German languages; the first volume will contain the nouns.

Under the auspices of the Berlin Academy, F. Ritschelius has brought out vol. 1 of a *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum*, containing lithographs of the epigraphic remains of the old Latinity, fol. 96 plates, 137 pp. letter press; price \$30.

The Canon Law of the Oriental Church is digested in Jos. Papp-Szilagyi *Enchiridion Juris Ecclesiastici Orientalis Catholicæ*—from the sources, pp. 656.

The last part of Brugsch's *Collection of Egyptian Monuments* has been published, containing 60 pages of text and 57 tables.

In Germany, the whole number of books (excluding pamphlets) published in 1862, was 9776 (in 1861, 9566), being about 27 a day. Theology takes the lead in 1459; history and biography, 591; jurisprudence and politics, 990; philosophy, only 94; medicine, 446; classical and oriental, 316; educational, 842; modern languages, 291; mathematics, 78; military, 207; architecture, 187; belles-lettres, 961; fine arts, 494, etc.

Wilke's well-known *Clavis Novi Testamenti* has been out of the market for several years; a new edition carefully revised by Prof. C. L. W. Grimm of Jena, is to be published in 4 livraisons, at 20 *groschen* each. The whole of Olshausen's Commentary on the New Test. is now offered for 14 *Thaler*: vols. 5 to 7, by Wiesinger and Ebrard for 8 *Thaler*.

Thousandth Anniversary in Moravia.—The Moravians intend during the present year to celebrate the thousandth anniversary of the introduction of Christianity into their country. Great preparations are to be made for the occasion, and visitors are expected to be present in large numbers from all the neighboring countries—Bohemia, Galicia, Croatia, Hungary, Posen, and Russian Poland.

The private correspondence between Goethe and Karl August, never published before, will soon appear in print. The present Grand Duke of Saxe Weimar has intrusted Dr. Vogel with the arrangement and publication of this correspondence, which, it is said, comprises about six hundred letters.

FRANCE.

Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne, dirigé par A. Bonnetty. 1863. Abbé Darras on the confirmation of the Bible from the Assyrian Inscript-

tions, as deciphered by M. Oppert : the chief point is in reference to King Sargon, mentioned in Isaiah xx, 1, and no where else ; and the account of the captivity in 2 Kings, xviii, 9-11. The new inscriptions show that Sargon reigned after Salmanasar V, having dethroned him. Bonnetty continues his learned account of the knowledge which the Romans had of the Jews. A curious pamphlet of Abbé Faydit against Malebranche (1699) is given in copious extracts. Faydit is the author of the noted satire on Malebranche's theory :

Lui qui voit tout en Dieu, n'y voit pas qu'il est fou.

M. B. Pautex has published a volume on the Errata in the Dictionary of the French Academy, which makes out a worse list of blunders and inconsistencies than the rival critics of Webster and Worcester were able to find in their Dictionaries.

M. Gerusez, well known by his valuable History of French Literature, has published an Abridgment, in a single volume, for the use of students, very condensed and valuable.

A new work by Abd-el-Kader is announced—*Abd-el-Kader et le Catholicisme*—to prove that Catholicism is too spiritual and Mosaism too material, and that the Islam faith reconciles matter and spirit in just proportions, and hence will prevail in history.

The *Revue Chrétienne* begins the year 1863 with authority to discuss questions bearing on politics. The editor De Pressensé in the January number has an excellent exposition of principles. The services of the noble Chancellor L'Hôpital for religious freedom (1550-'60) are narrated by Delaborde. St. Hilaire commends Prof. Bost's Epoch of the Maccabees; and De Guerle has an essay on the Religious Opinions of Milton. In the February number, Schæffer concludes an essay on the mystic and unknown philosopher Saint-Martin, who saw things "beyond the sun". Rev. G. Fisch contributes an earnest defence of our country: Astié discourses on the Religious Awakening in Switzerland and France. March: Lichtenberger on Uhland; Astié on the Revival of Religion.

The Academician, M. E. Littré has published the first part of his *Dictionnaire de la Langue Française*, on which he has been at work for fifteen years. Critics give it the highest praise for its thoroughness, and its superiority to the Dictionary of the Academy. Three paragraphs are devoted to each word, giving its definition with examples, its history, and its etymology. A new edition of M. Littré's History of the French Language has also just been issued by Didier & Co.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The British and Foreign Evangelical Review, Jan. 1863, reprints from the Presbyterian Quarterly, Rev. A. Barnes's article on the Readjustment of Christianity, and the Matter of Prophecy from the Princeton Review. An able article on the Philosophy of the Unconditioned opposes the views of Hamilton and Mansel. The Theories of the Sabbath, Dominical and Sabatarian, Hippolytus against Noctus, the Literature of Pascal's Thoughts, etc., are topics of other articles. The number for April, reprints two articles on Dr. Hickok from the *Princeton Review*; one on the Relation of Adam to his Posterity from the Christian Review, and Dr. Pond on the Laws of Moral Influence, from the same review. It also gives a condensed translation of Dörner on the Immutability of God: a translation of a part of Rudelbach's article on Inspiration, published some thirty years ago in the

Lutherische Zeitschrift, valuable for the history of the doctrine. Other articles are on Priestley, the Madras Mission, Davidson and Colenso.

Journal of Sacred Literature. April, 1863. The Codex Sinaiticus—a good account and vindication. Memoirs of Bossuet—continued. Notes of a Visit to Malta. Renan—an account of his pantheistic speculations. The Importance of Linguistic Preparations for the Ministry, by Rev. Chs. H. Wright—a valuable lecture; it gives an enumeration of the Arabic works published by our American Board. The Buddhist Scriptures, and their Language, the Pali, by Jas. Alwis, Esq. The Bible as the Word of God. Exegesis of Difficult Texts. Anecdota Syriaca, an account of the recent volume of Dr. Land of Holland, edited from the British Museum manuscripts. The Samaritan Pentateuch. Obituary of Dr. Edward Robinson. Correspondence. Notices of Books. Of all the English theological publications this Journal is the best one for our ministers. Under the editorship of Mr. Cowper it is amply sustaining its high character.

Rev. B. W. Savile's work on *Revelation and Science* is said by the Journal of Sacred Literature to be one of the best works on the recent controversies raised by Bunsen, the Essays and Reviews, and similar works.

The question of Faith and Reason is agitating the English Catholics. The new periodical *Home and Foreign Review*, the successor of the *Rambler*, is denounced as rationalistic by Bp. Ullathorne. Mr. Simpson has replied in various articles, collected from the *Rambler*, and published under the title *Forms of Intuition*. He maintains that faith is a form of reason; and that the provinces of theology and science are entirely distinct. This is denied by Brownson, in his *Quarterly Review*, April, who says, that thus there is no reconciliation possible between the two, and who urges a "dialectic union and harmony of the matters of revelation with the matters of science", thus alone making one whole.

The *Anti-Colenso Literature* is still growing fast. Some sixty works have been published. Edward Greswell, *The Objections to the Historical Character of the Pentateuch*. 5s. Wm. H. Hoare, *Age and Authorship of the Pentateuch*, in reply to Colenso's Part II. Rev. Jas. R. Page, *The Pretensions of Bp. Colenso*. 5s. Robert Moon, *The Pent. and Book of Joshua*. 5s.—said to be one of the best. Prof. McCaul's *Examination*, in a people's edition for 1s. Rev. F. Ashpitel, *The Increase of the Israelites*. John B. Marsh, *Is the Pent. Historically True?* Rev. T. R. Birks, *The Exodus of Israel*, etc., prepared for the Tract Society, with great care. Dr. Bemish's articles in the *Jewish Chronicle* are republished. Rev. W. A. Scott, D.D. (late of this country), *Moses and the Pentateuch*, a vol. of 185 pp.: the *Literary Churchman* says of it: "His book has an air of Presbyterian poetry about it, which will do good to many simple hearts, but touch no one's reason who is critically disposed". G. S. Drew's *Examination* is said to be well done. Rev. J. G. Hewlett, *Bible Difficulties explained*. 2s. 6d. Rev. G. E. Biber, *Veracity and Divine Authority of the Pentateuch*, deals with the 600,000 armed men.

Dean Ellicott, now Bp. of Gloucester and Bristol, was born in 1819, educated at Cambridge; obtained Hulsean Prize, 1842, for an essay on the Obligations of the Sabbath; wrote a treatise on Analytical Statics; Prof. of Divinity at King's College, London, succeeding Dean Trench: 1860, Hulsean Professor of Divinity at Cambridge; Dean of Exeter, 1861; has written commentaries on Galatians, Ephesians, Philip., Colos., Thessal., Philemon and the Pastoral Epistles. His last work is on the Life of our Lord, republished in Boston.

An edition of the Sinaitic Codex is to be published in London by Williams & Norgate for 18s. Some English journals continue the advocacy of

the impudent claims of Simonides: as others do of the pretensions of the Southern Confederacy.

It is not often that a cabinet minister is found making a collection of Hymns; but Sir Roundell Palmer in his *Book of Praise*, 12mo, pp. 472, has gathered together one of the choicest collections that has been made. The book is published by Macmillan & Co. Cambridge.

Theological Works. Rev. Rd. Brigham has prepared a revised Prayer Book under the title *Liturgicæ recusæ Exemplar*, consisting of old and revised formularies. Rev. Dr. J. M. Neale's papers on liturgical subjects have been collected from the Christian Remembrancer and other sources under the title *Essays on Liturgiology and Church History*. The late Prof. Rask's tractates on the longevity of the patriarchs, the flood, the exodus, etc. have been translated from the Danish and published by Trübner & Co. Rev. C. P. Shepherd, *The Argument of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans*. Vol. I. Pt. I. 10s. *Lectures on Theology, Science and Revelation* by Geo. Legge, LL.D., with a Memoir.—James Gibson, D.D., of Free Church College, Glasgow, *Present Truths in Theology*—on man's inability and God's sovereignty. 2 vols. 21s.—Rev. Robt. Jamieson, Fausset and David Brown, *A Commentary on Old and New Testaments*, 6 vols. for £2 5s. in preparation. Dr. Lange's *Life of Christ* is announced by Clark, Edinb. in 6 vols. £1 15s.

The first well executed English translation of the "Thoughts" of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus, has been made by Mr. George Long, one of the editors of the *Bibliotheca Classica*. The Emperor was born A.D. 121, and belonged to the sect of the Stoics. His Meditations have in them much of pure and lofty morality.

Spinoza's *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*; a Critical Inquiry into the Hebrew Scriptures, has been translated, and is published with an Introduction and Notes, by Trübner of London.

Macmillan & Co. publish *The Missionary History of the Middle Ages*, by the Rev. George Frederick MacClear, Classical Master in King's College, London.

The second volume of Dr. William Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, is promised to be ready in London in the course of the present month. Little, Brown & Co. are the American publishers.

Oliphant & Co. (Edinburgh) have commenced republishing Dr. Jacobus' excellent Notes on the New Testament.

A new volume by John Foster is soon to appear. It will contain "An Essay on the Improvement of Time, and other Literary Remains," with a preface by one of the author's oldest surviving friends, John Sheppard, Esq., of Frome, and will be edited by Mr. J. E. Ryland. The "Essay" has never before been given to the world, but has remained in the possession of Mr. Foster's family. Several eminent literary persons have expressed a high opinion of its merits, and we believe it will be found quite worthy of the author's reputation. It is to be republished by the Appletons.

ORDINATION STATISTICS.—The *Clerical Journal* publishes the ordination statistics for 1862. It appears that there have been 68 ordinations held during the past year, at which 1032 candidates were ordained; of these 508 were ordained deacons, and 524 were ordained priests. This number falls short by 86 of the number ordained in the previous year. Of the candidates ordained in 1861, there were 856 from the four Universities; whilst in 1862 there were 780, thus showing a falling off of 76 in this direction.

The average number of readers at the British Museum in 1862 was four hundred and nineteen per day, and each reader, on an average consulted ten volumes. Deducting fifty-two for the Sundays and twenty-one days (at a

guess) for holidays, we have thus a total of about a million and a quarter of volumes consulted in the course of the year.

The London *Jewish Chronicle* states that Mr. Saville Davis, of Worcester College, has recently been admitted to the degree of B.A., being the *first Jew on whom that honor has been conferred in the University*.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

A new edition of Mr. Ticknor's History of Spanish Literature, revised and rewritten, is announced in three volumes. Mr. Ticknor is also preparing a life of Prescott, the historian. Alger's History of the Doctrine of a Future Life will soon be published, with a full bibliography, prepared by Ezra Abbott. The second part of Allibone's Dictionary of Authors is making as rapid progress as is possible. Edward Everett is reported to be writing a work on the Law of Nations. Draper's History of the Intellectual Development of Europe is published by the Harpers. The Appletons are to republish Mill's Political Economy and Merivale's Romans under the Empire. Gould & Lincoln announce Gillette's Life and Times of Huss—an elaborate work, and a translation by Rev. W. L. Gage of Ritter's Geographical Studies. The ninth volume of Mr. Bancroft's History of the United States is in press. Mr. Scribner will publish a translation of Laboulaye's Political Studies on the United States; Bushnell's Work and Offices of Christ; a second series of Max Müller's Lectures on Language; Maurice's History of Philosophy.

Mr. Geo. W. Childs has begun the publication of the American Publishers' Circular and Literary Gazette, in a very complete form. It will appear twice a month at \$2 a year. The plan and arrangement are excellent. For libraries and literary men, as well as publishers, it will be invaluable.

The Christian Review (Baptist) for January has a translation by Dr. Arnold of Alexander de Stourdza (of Odessa) on the Greek Church—a translation of his work, *The Double Parallel*, published in French in 1848, in reply to Pope Pius IX's Encyclical, exhorting the patriarchs and bishops of the East to accept his authority. It is an interesting and valuable exposition of the differences of the Greek and Roman churches, and also of the points of division between the Greek and Protestant views. Stourdza also published at Vienna in 1816, *Considerations on the Doctrine and Spirit of the Orthodox (Greek) Church*.

Dr. Miron Winslow's Tamil and English Dictionary, published some months since at Madras, elicits warm encomiums. The work was begun nearly thirty years ago by Rev. J. Knight, of the English mission, assisted by a native, Tissera, and others. After Mr. Knight's death it was prosecuted at the American mission at Jaffna. Rev. Levi Spaulding brought out the Tamil Dictionary, and Rev. S. Hutchings worked on the English. Since 1842 the work has been in Mr. Winslow's hands. It is a boon to the Madras Presidency, as well as to the cause of missions.

The Arabic Bible.—The Board of Managers of the American Bible Society have made provision for printing the Beyrut translation of the Arabic Scriptures, which has been for years in progress by the late Rev. Dr. Eli Smith and Rev. Dr. C. V. Van Dyck. The whole of the New Testament is finished, and the Old Testament so far as the Book of Proverbs. Editions of the finished portions have already been printed, and are in growing circulation. There will be a great demand for this translation, which is acknowledged by the first living Arabic scholars to be the best extant. It will give the word of God to one hundred millions of people who speak the

Arabic language. It is found that vast numbers of people in Central Africa are able to read in Arabic.

A curious contrast is afforded by the respective returns of the number of newspapers and magazines in Great Britain and the United States. In January of this year there were but seventeen hundred and forty three (1,743) papers and magazines published in the United Kingdom, while the numbers in the United States, by the census of 1860, were four thousand and fifty one (4,051). Out of the total of seventeen hundred and forty-three publications in Great Britain, five hundred and thirty-seven were magazines, of which no less than two hundred and seventeen were of a religious character. The population of Great Britain and the United States is about the same (in round numbers, thirty millions). Of the daily papers in Great Britain, forty-six are published in England, nine in Scotland, and one in Wales.

A new geographical and historical map of the Holy Land and Syria, by Lyman Coleman, D.D., and Prof. H. S. Osborn, is to be published by subscription by L. Coleman, Easton, Pa., and R. L. Barnes, of Philadelphia. Every biblical place will be represented in conspicuous characters, large in proportion to the importance of the place. The map will contain, besides, all places alluded to by historical writers, both ancient and modern, and important missionary stations. Great pains have been taken to insure minuteness, correctness, and elegance. The price will be ten dollars for the map, together with Dr. Coleman's historical *Geography and Atlas* and Prof. Osborn's *Plants of the Holy Land*.

The death at Yonkers, of Rev. Dr. Baird, has removed from us one whose name has been for over a generation identified with many of our prominent religious societies.

Robert Baird was born in Fayette county, Pennsylvania, on the 6th of October, 1798, and in 1818 graduated at Jefferson College in that State. He studied theology at Princeton, New Jersey, and in 1822 was licensed to preach. In Princeton he for five years conducted a grammar school, but in 1828 relinquished it, to form a connection with the American Bible Society as a missionary agent in the State of New Jersey. Subsequently he travelled through all parts of the United States in behalf of the American Sunday-School Union; and in 1835 extended his travels to Europe, where he remained over eight years, preaching in behalf of temperance and Protestantism. He has since that time been connected in different capacities with various religious organizations.

Dr. Baird has written several valuable books. His "View of the Valley of the Mississippi" was published in 1832. The "History of the Temperance Societies" appeared in 1836, and was translated into German, Dutch, Swedish, Finnish and Russ. "Religion in America", printed in Glasgow in 1842, won nearly as great a popularity, and "Protestantism in Italy", published in Boston in 1845, attracted considerable attention at the time. Besides these Dr. Baird has edited several religious memoirs, and has written very largely for the periodical and newspaper press of this country and England.

Mr. Richard Grant White's *Life of Shakespeare* is in preparation, and will probably be published the present season. It will complete the edition of *Shakespeare's Works*, in twelve volumes, published by Messrs. Little & Brown.

ART. X.—CRITICISMS ON BOOKS.

THEOLOGY.

Handbuch der Protestantischen Polemik gegen die Römisch-Katholische Kirche, von Dr. KARL HASE. Leipzig. 1862. Pp. 665. It is nearly thirty years since Möhler published his Symbolism—the most plausible and effective modern apology for Rome. It was ably encountered by Nitzsch and Baur—the work of the latter, in spite of his pantheistic tendencies, containing a thorough vindication of Protestant doctrine. Dr. Hase, as his Preface informs us, began at that time to write a reply, which, after years of elaboration, is now published. It was begun and finished at Rome. Written with a full mastery of the subject, in a style at once manly and popular, acute and concise in argument, and pregnant with wit, it cannot fail to take a high place in the literature of Protestant polemic theology. On the questions of the Church, its unity and infallibility, of the papacy and its claims, of the priesthood and celibacy, of good works, of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and of the sacraments, it defends the Protestant doctrine with skill and effect. Some of the doctrinal points, e. g., original sin and man's primitive state, are only incidentally discussed. On the doctrine of justification by faith, the semi-rationalistic position of the author renders his conduct of the argument less satisfactory. The volume is divided into three Books: 1. The Church; 2. Salvation; 3. Incidental Topics (*Beisachen*), such as Cultus, Art, Science and Literature, Politics and Nationality. In the present state of Europe, the chapter on the temporal power (the Pope-King) claims and merits special attention for its lucid and satisfactory exposition. The volume is not written for ministers and theologians alone; it is such as an intelligent and thoughtful reader would thoroughly like and appreciate.

The eighth (supplementary) volume of the *Lives of the Fathers of the Lutheran Church*, contains the lives of Justus Jonas, the friend of Luther, and teacher of theology at Wittenberg; of Caspar Cruciger, also active at Wittenberg; of Paulus Speratus, court preacher at Königsberg, and bishop of Pomerania; of Lazarus Spengler, the reformer of Nuremberg; of Nicholas Van Amsdorf, Superintendent at Magdeburg, and a leader in the Majoristic and Synergistic controversies; of Paul Eber, also Superintendent and professor of theology; of Martin Chemnitz, the renowned author of the Examination of the Council of Trent; and of David Chyträus, Professor at Rostock, and, with Chemnitz, active in the formation of the Formula Concordiæ. All of these biographies are by Dr. Theodore Pressel, and cast much light upon both the external and internal history of the Reformation. The lives of Luther, by Schneider, of Osiander, by Lehnerdt, and of Bugenhagen, by Vogt, are still to be issued.

Letters of the Rev. JOHN SMITH, a Presbyterian Minister, to his Brother, the Rev. PETER SMITH, a Methodist Preacher. Philadelphia. Lippincott & Co. 1862. 12mo, pp. 188. The points of difference between Calvinism and Arminianism are here briefly discussed, in a good spirit and with creditable ability.

A Collection of Theological Essays from various authors. With an Introduction by GEORGE N. NOYES, D.D., Professor of Sacred Literature in Harvard University. Third Edition. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co. New

York: O. S. Felt. 12mo, pp. 512. These Essays are too well known to need a formal notice in this REVIEW. Their theological character is indicated by the fact that they are published for and in behalf of the American Unitarian Association. They represent the Broad-Church School, and receive special significance from recent developments in England and elsewhere. While we should take issue with these Essays on many of the essential points discussed in them, we still commend them as worthy the attention of all thinking men, and especially of those who are set for the defence of the faith.

BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

The Pentateuch vindicated from the Aspersions of Bishop Colenso. By WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary. New York: John Wiley. 1863. The pretensions, false assumptions, contradictions and illogical reasonings of Bishop Colenso are unsparingly exposed in this acute polemic treatise. Dr. Green is at home in the literature of the subject. He takes up the objections in detail, and gives in the main satisfactory replies. The subject has been so thoroughly treated by Dr. Goodwin in this REVIEW, that we need not enter into a statement of the questions involved. We notice that Professor Green adopts the view that the abode in Egypt was 430 years. His book, sharply written, almost with the fervor of a personal discussion, takes a leading place among the sixty volumes which have been published in reply to the Bishop of Natal.

The Holy Word its own Defence: Addressed to Bishop Colenso, and all other earnest Seekers after Truth. By Rev. ABIEL SILVER. New York: Appletons. 1863. If any body takes this book in hand with the expectation of finding in it a detailed reply to Colenso, he will be sorely disappointed. It is a work on Swedenborgianism, to show that the so-called Science of Correspondences is the only way of interpreting Scripture so as to get rid of difficulties. But we think it is easier to reply to Colenso than to defend the Swedenborgian theories. To try to do both at once is needlessly embarrassing. Alleged errors of facts and detail are not refuted by supposing that the words may have some mystic sense. When an author, for example, would explain the difficulties about Jonah and the whale, by saying that the fish means skepticism, and that Jonah's being three days in the whale's belly means that he was under the power of skepticism for a time—this is more amusing than convincing. In other respects, the work is a fair and well written account of some of the Swedenborgian doctrines and imaginations.

The Spiritual Point of View; or the Glass Reversed. An Answer to Bishop Colenso. By M. MAHAN, D.D. New York: Appletons. Dr. Mahan's method of reply has already been fully discussed in the pages of our Review. On several questions of detail his replies are sharp and pertinent.

The New Testament; with Brief Explanatory Notes (or Scholia). By HOWARD CROSBY, D.D. New York: Scribner. \$1.50. These notes, prepared by a careful scholar, are based on a thorough study of the Greek, without any parade of Greek learning. They are very much to the point, correcting the translation, illustrating historic and archaeological references, showing the connection of thought, etc. Of course all difficulties are not explained; and the plan of the book prevented discussion. But they will be found very valuable. We wish that the author had also given a concise introduction to each of the books.

Bunsen's Bibelwerk.—The first half of the 5th volume is just out, containing the Psalms, with a revised translation, in parallelisms, by A. Kamphausen, teacher in Bonn. Concise exegetical notes illustrate the text. This translation will take a high rank among the modern versions of the Psalms.

The Words of the Lord Jesus. By RUDOLF STIER, D.D. Translated by W. B. Pope. Revised by Jas. Strong, D.D., and Henry B. Smith, D.D. Part 2. These Words of the Lord Jesus will be published in 12 parts, making 2 vols., and including the *Words of the Angels*. The *Words of the Apostles*, by the same author, will make another volume of 6 parts. The price is 75 cents a part. The work is issued by Mr. Tibbals for the Ministers' Library Association, 37 Park Row, and 145 Nassau st. Of Stier, recently deceased, we give a short account under another head. He was a most earnest and devoted preacher. He preached the Bible. His commentaries went through the pulpit, and so are well adapted to ministers' use. He is a very ingenious, fertile and evangelical expositor. He surveys the text in all lights, and examines diverging views. No one can read his writings without great profit. He was a Lutheran, and not a Calvinist; and some of his comments show this bias, but not in such a way as to be offensive to the reader.

The Last Times and the Great Consummation. An earnest discussion of momentous themes. By JOSEPH A. SEISS, D.D., author of "The Gospel in Leviticus", "The Parable of the Ten Virgins", "The Day of the Lord", "Lecture on the Epistle to the Hebrews", etc. Revised and enlarged edition. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1863. 12mo, pp. 438. This work is considered among the ablest of its school. Dr. Seiss is an earnest advocate of the Millenarian doctrine. He has evidently bestowed a good deal of time and thought upon the subject, and gives to the world, in this new and enlarged edition of his book, his latest and maturest views upon it. To those who desire to see the argument on which Second Advent views rest, we commend this work of Dr. Seiss: we doubt if they have found an abler or more earnest advocate. We need not say that we totally dissent from the views of this school, believing them to be unscriptural and pernicious in their tendency.

Triumphs of the Bible with the Testimony of Science to its Truth. By Rev. HENRY TULLIDGE, A.M. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863. 12mo, pp. 439. This book is timely and judicious. It attempts too much to be thorough and exhaustive; and it cannot lay claim to originality either in the way of investigation or argument, and hence has no particular scientific value; still it meets the plausible attacks of infidelity in its latest developments fairly and in a popular and satisfactory manner, and vindicates the truth of Revelation by a great variety of testimony patiently collated from many of the ablest writers and presented in a style fresh and intelligible. The portion of it which sets forth the Testimony of Science to the Bible is specially interesting and valuable. The author evinces familiarity with the entire literature of the subject, and gives good and sufficient reasons for rejecting much of the science of the day, *falsely so called*. His chapters on Geology, on the Unity of the Human Race, and on Chronology aim to defend those outposts of the Bible which modern infidelity is assailing with such ingenuity and such persistent efforts. We cordially commend the book as a timely and judicious contribution to the great mass of Christian Evidences.

Bible Illustrations, being a Storehouse of Similes, Allegories and Anecdotes, selected from Spencer's "Things New and Old", and other sources, with an Introduction by Rev. RICHARD NEWTON, D.D., and a copious Index.

Philadelphia : Smith, English & Co. New York : Carter & Brothers. 1863. 12mo, pp. 360. This title faithfully describes the book. The selection strikes us as judicious. There is nothing that we discover in these illustrations to offend good taste. They are for the most part apt and suggestive, and bear on almost every point of doctrine and morals. As a book of reference it may often aid the preacher and the Sunday-school teacher.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

The History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin. By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ, D.D. 2 vols. New York: R. Carter. 1863. These volumes are introduced by a special address to the American public, avowing the author's sympathy with our national cause. They are the first instalment of a work on the Reformation in the French speaking countries of Europe. In Switzerland the struggle resulted in political as well as religious freedom. A large part of the first volume is occupied with an account of parties and conflicts in Geneva, before the coming of Calvin. The narrative is minute yet graphic. It is here brought down, in both France and Switzerland to 1534. The account of the early training and preparation of Calvin for his reforming work is admirably done. Margaret of Navarre is also fully described, with evident partiality. We have not in English literature any work which goes over this period so fully and accurately; none which describes the actors and scenes in such dramatic style. The style strikes us as an improvement upon that in the author's previous volumes, with less attempt at artistic effect, and a more rigid adherence to the authentic words of the speakers and actors in this great drama. The book cannot fail of being a popular history, in the best sense of the phrase. It may not have as enthusiastic a reception as the earlier volumes on Luther, but it will give pleasure to the scholar, and instruction to all. The union of order and liberty in the work of reform is the main theme, reading to us most important lessons in the midst of our present conflicts. A good likeness of Calvin is prefixed to the first volume.

The Invasion of the Crimea: its Origin and an Account of its Progress down to the Death of Lord Raglan. By ALEXANDER WILLIAM KINGLAKE. Vol. I, New York: Harpers. 1863. pp. 750. This history of the Crimean campaign is an attack upon the French Emperor. Written with consummate skill, with access to the best sources of information, and with rare descriptive talent, it enchains the attention of the reader, as if the scenes were transpiring before his eyes. The object of the author is, not merely to vindicate Lord Raglan but to impugn the policy of the English government, and to cover Louis Napoleon with disgrace. It is a history, but it is also a terrible satire. The leading idea of the book is, that Louis Napoleon, with a band of bold and perjured conspirators, by craft and violence got possession of France, and then, to bolster up an insecure throne, entered into alliance with England, and forced her to follow him in making war against Russia. England is exhibited throughout as the subservient victim of French diplomacy and intrigues. At the same time, in the account of the Crimean campaign, the military plans and valor of the English are defended against the covert insinuations or open attacks of French critics. While, now, there is no doubt that the French Emperor obtained his power through fraud and violence, yet, it strikes us that the author is obliged to strain many facts in order to make out his main argument. The position of England was much more honorable, and her policy much wiser, than is

here represented. Had she not then interfered, the Russian power would have become predominant in the East. The descriptions of personal character are wrought out in sharp outlines. Nobody can begin the book without running through it. The Harpers edition is well brought out, and gives us for a dollar and a half what costs five times as much in the English copy.

* *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church.* Part I. Abraham to Samuel. By A. P. STANLEY, D.D. With Maps and Plans. New York: Chas. Scribner. 1863. 8vo, pp. 572. The Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge is bringing new life into his department of instruction. By previous studies and travels well fitted for this work, he presents a vivid picture of the ancient Jewish people, making the absent present, and giving life-like narratives of the events and characters of those early days. For such descriptions the free form of the lecture is well adapted. It allows the writer to group together whatever may heighten the effect of the picture, and to bring in illustrations from various sources. Of this privilege Dr. Stanley has made liberal use, and produced a most attractive volume. He writes, too, in sufficient sympathy with the spirit of the men and times to enter into their circumstances and give us what they thought and felt, without intermingling the doctrines and traditions of later times. As was to be expected from the author's antecedents his criticism is free, and he remains in doubt about many questions which are now sharply debated. Evidently his leanings are very strong towards the liberal school of interpretation, and his views of the inspiration of the old records are quite vague, even if he admits any proper inspiration at all. Many of the questions raised by Colenso's arithmetic he dismisses as if they were of no sort of importance for his object. He does not know whether the Israelites were in Egypt 215 or 430 or 1000 years. He leaves the question whether the number of armed Israelites who left Egypt, was "600 or 600,000 men" to be decided by others. He implies that monotheism was unknown before Abraham, and that the name Jehovah was unknown to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He cannot tell how the Israelites were supported in their journeyings. He ascribes the priesthood to an Egyptian origin. If we only admit the arithmetical errors lately pointed out, and give up the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, he thinks we should "remove at one stroke some of the main difficulties of the Mosaic narrative". At a time when these questions are so fully discussed, we think that an author, writing on these subjects might well have been expected to come to some more definite conclusions, or to fortify his opinions by more thorough investigations, and we regret that Dr. Stanley has not done this. The work is not satisfactory, either in affirmation or denial, in the controverted points. And yet it is a brilliant course of lectures. New matter is furnished to the historian in the appendices on the Cave of Machpelah and the Samaritan Passover. The getting up of the book by Mr. Scribner is in every respect admirable.

The Works of Rufus Choate with a Memoir of his Life. By SAMUEL GILMAN BROWN, Prof. in Dartmouth College. 2 vols. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. Professor Brown has reared a fitting monument to the memory of one of the most gifted and fascinating of the sons of New England. Mr. Choate had an oriental imagination combined with Yankee sense. He seemed almost like an exotic in the land of his birth, and yet he thrived there. No man of his times united such apparently contradictory traits. He was impulsive yet had entire self-command; in many things simple as a child, he yet swayed masses of men with great power; the closest of students, he also courted society; the most fluent of speakers, he carefully

studied his utterances; the most imaginative of lawyers, a severe and sharp logic runs through all his harangues; every thing he said seemed spontaneous, yet it was all the fruit of anxious toil. He was the most magnetic orator we ever heard; nobody within sound of his voice could get disenthralled from his spell. Yet, when he was most prodigal in his vocabulary, he was also most intent upon his main object.

His life is worthy of study. And it is here admirably depicted. Ministers should read it, if only to learn the lesson, how to make all their studies and reading bear upon the great art of public address. We have been surprised at the record of his diligence, the wide range of his studies, his careful husbandry of time. His plans for reading and writing, outside of his professional course, were carefully made, and clung to with tenacity. He always had with him some classic, Greek, Roman, or English—some work in literature—some commentary, to fill up his leisure moments. Rare specimens of his translations from Thucydides and Tacitus are given in the appendix to these volumes—not prepared for the press, yet well fitted for the eye of scholars. Large extracts from his journals give us much about his method of study and glimpses into his delightful private life. Of his religious life we have only glimpses; he was attached to the orthodox faith, yet he shrunk from speaking of his personal feelings. His career as a lawyer is fully related, and also his political course. In the latter part of his life, he left the Whig party with which he had been associated, and became a Democrat—doubtless from love to the unity to his country, yet in this clearly showing how even the most sagacious and pure-minded of men may utterly mistake the true character and bearings of the history, which they may have a part in making.

This biography will take its place among our treasured books. And long will students resort to these wonderful speeches and addresses to attempt to learn the secret of that inspiring eloquence which equally charmed people and politicians, lawyers and judges, and scholars of every profession.

Memoirs of Mrs. Joanna Bethune. By her son, the Rev. GEORGE W. BETHUNE, D.D. With an Appendix, containing extracts from the writings of Mrs. BETHUNE. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863. 12mo, pp. 250. This Memoir is the last work of the gifted BETHUNE—and it is a most touching tribute to the memory of his sainted mother. These last fruits of his pen will be read with tearful interest and cherished by his numerous friends with an almost sacred regard. The lines (66 in number) addressed some years since to his mother, are exquisitely tender and beautiful. Had we space we would give them entire. They are scarcely inferior to Cowper's celebrated lines. Few sons have had such a mother to love and to bless them; and few mothers have had such a son to appreciate and chronicle their virtues! The extracts from the writings of Mrs. Bethune, which comprise half the volume, exhibit a life of deep spiritual feeling, extraordinary activity, and strong faith in the covenant promises. She bears a striking resemblance to her mother, Mrs. Isabella Graham. These Memoirs are adapted to stimulate Christian ladies in their prayers and labors in behalf of a suffering and dying world. The life of Dr. Bethune remains to be written. We trust he will find a fitting biographer.

Triumph in Trial. A Memorial of SARAH S. MUGFORD, of Salem, Mass., by S. M. WORCESTER, D.D. Boston: Published for the author by Crocker & Brewster. 1862. 18mo, pp. 108. A precious Memorial of a character of extraordinary sweetness and purity, made perfect through a long and severe process of suffering. It is eminently adapted to comfort and strengthen those who are called to suffer.

Harper's Pictorial History of the Great Rebellion Nos. 1-4. Price 25 cents each. Among the many descriptions of the Southern secession and revolt, this work of the Harpers takes the lead, in the variety and excellence of its illustrations, the beauty of its typographical execution and the careful historical statements of its text. It is of deep interest to all classes of readers. It will be issued at the rate of one number a month until completed. It should receive a generous support.

The Life, Writings, and Character of EDWARD ROBINSON, D.D., LL.D. This small volume, published by Randolph, is made up of Remarks by Prof. H. B. Smith at the announcement of the death of Dr. Robinson, at a meeting of the New York Historical Society, Feb. 3, 1863, and of an Address of Prof. R. D. Hitchcock before the same Society, March 24. It is published under the auspices of the Society. In the address of Prof. Hitchcock is a long and interesting account of the ancestors of Dr. Robinson, drawn from the biography of Rev. William Robinson, written by his son, the Professor, and printed for private distribution in 1859. The whole address is a felicitous account of the life, works and character of our great American Christian scholar.

PHILOSOPHY.

Ad BENEDICTI DE SPINOZA Opera quæ supersunt omnia Supplementum. Amstelodami, 1862, pp. 360. BENEDICTI DE SPINOZA Tractatus de Deo et Homine ejusque Felicitate Lineamenta, etc., edidit ED. BOEHMERUS. Hæge ad Salam, 1852, 4to, pp. 63. The second of these works contains an outline of an early treatise of Spinoza, found ten years ago appended in ms. to a copy of the Life of Spinoza, by Colerus. Soon afterwards the whole treatise, in Belgic, was also discovered by Müller, the Amsterdam bookseller, and it is now published by Van Vloten, with a Latin version. Boehmer's work also contains additional notes to Spinoza's Tractatus Theologico-Politicus. Van Vloten has also exhumed and published, in the above volume, Spinoza's Essay on the Rainbow, and various letters and documents relating to his life and works. Though these various publications do not add much to our knowledge of the Spinozistic philosophy, they are all valuable in the way of elucidation and confirmation. Van Vloten's edition is accompanied with a likeness of Spinoza, and a fac-simile of his chirography. It is printed uniformly with Bruder's Leipsic edition of Spinoza's works. Van Vloten has also published an elaborate work on the Life and Writings of Spinoza.

From Boehmer's work, pp. 49-50, we extract a clear statement and summary of the fundamental points in Spinoza's system. DEFINITIONES: I. Deum definitio esse Ens constans infinitis attributis quorum unumquodque est infinitum sive summe perfectum in suo genere. II. Per attributum intelligo omne id quod concipitur per se et in se adeo ut ipsius conceptus non involvat conceptum alterius rei. Ut ex. gr. extensio per se et in se concipitur; at motus non item. Nam concipitur in alio et ipsius conceptus involvit extensionem. III. Ea res dicitur in suo genere infinita quæ alia ejusdem naturæ terminari nequit. Sic corpus non terminatur cogitatione nec cogitatio corpore. IV. Per substantiam intelligo id quod per se et in se concipitur, hoc est ejus conceptus non involvit conceptum alterius rei. V. Per modificationem sive per accidens intelligo id quod in alio est et per id in quo est concipitur. AXIOMATA: I. Substantia prior est natura suis accidentibus. II. Præter substantias et accidentia nihil datur realiter sive extra intellectum. III. Res quæ diversa habent attributa, nihil habent inter se commune. IV. Rerum quæ nihil commune habent inter se, una alterius

causa esse non potest. PROPOSITIONES: I. In rerum natura non possunt dari duae aut plures substantiae ejusdem attributi. II. Substantia non potest produci neque ab alia quacumque substantia, sed est de ipsius essentia existere. III. Omnis substantia debet esse infinita sive summe perfecta in suo genere."

Einleitung in die Philosophie und Encyclopädie der Philosophie. Von GUSTAV THAULOW. Kiel. 1862. Pp. 144. We have previously known the author of this volume only by a sharp pamphlet addressed to Barthélemy St. Hilaire, on the way in which German Philosophy is criticised in France. He has also written a work on Hegel's views on Education, and several pamphlets and essays on philosophical subjects. He is reckoned as a Hegelian, though he also claims to be an independent thinker. The present Introduction to Philosophy is a clear and useful book, discussing in part the best mode of teaching philosophy in the University course, with many pertinent hints. A good deal of it is aphoristic and merely suggestive—hints for Lectures. The First Part examines and defines the leading philosophical terms and conceptions. The Second Part is an exposition of the principles of the most noted modern philosophers. The Third Part gives an Encyclopædia of the Philosophical Sciences. His arrangement is the following: 1. Logic and Metaphysics; 2. Philosophy of Nature; 3. Anthropology and Psychology; 4. Philosophy of Religion; 5. Aesthetics; 6. Ethics; 7. Philosophy of Right and Law; 8. Politics; 9. Paedagogics; 10. History of Philosophy; 11. Historical Philosophy of Religion; 12. History of Art; 13. Philosophical History of Religion; 14. Philosophy of History.

Dr. A. Schmid, Roman Catholic Professor at Dillingen, known by a work on the Thomist and Scotist doctrine of Certainty, has just published a volume on *Philosophical Tendencies in the Sphere of Modern Catholicism*, reviewing the theories of Hermes and Günther, Baader's theosophy, Traditionalism, and especially the Tübingen Catholic School, represented by Kuhn in its conflicts with Clemens and others—which last he terms the New Scholastic School. All of these tendencies were called forth by the endeavor to reconcile Catholic theology with modern thought—faith with philosophy. Kuhn objects to scholasticism, that it subjects philosophy to theology, denying any independent philosophy; that it allows no ground or hold for the evidences; and that it does not recognize any immediate (intuitive) knowledge. His own positions are in substance these: that philosophy and theology have of right a relative independence; that both are constructed upon an immediate basis of faith; that they are to be reconciled in and by a truly speculative theology, which, however, must not confound their respective rights; that a philosophy controlled by theology, and a theology derived solely from pure reason, are equally objectionable.

The main points of controversy between these two schools are thus summed up by Schmid: 1. On immediate and mediate knowledge. Rational truths, universal and necessary, are every where presupposed, says Kuhn. 2. Ontologism and Psychologism. Aquinas and his school represent the latter; Malebranche, Gerdil, Thomassin, Gioberti, Baader, Gratry, and the Louvain professors, are ontologists. The psychologists hold that we only know the "species", or images of things; the ontologists, that we know their real being or nature in God. The truth, says Schmid, lies between them. 3. Whether philosophy be free or bound by authority. 4. The functions of reason in respect to the Evidences; Kuhn's position is, that reason must prove the authority of a revelation, and also has a right

to inquire in respect to what it says and means; yet that theology as a science is built up upon the basis of authority. 5. Whether a strictly rational knowledge comports with theological belief. 6. On Tradition. The Jesuits hold that man could have made a language without divine aid (it was not so in fact, but was possible). The professors of Louvain, De Maistre, Gratry, and others, hold that man, in order to speech, needed both external and internal solicitation, both ideas and revelation. Both contain elements of the truth; for language belongs to the human organism, and language is a gift of God.

Akademische Reden. Von KUNO FISCHER. Stuttgart. 1862. The first of the two orations which make up this elegant volume is an enthusiastic eulogy of J. G. Fichte, as exemplifying the union of the profoundest thought and most inspiring popular eloquence with the highest moral energy. The second is on the Two Kantian Schools of Jena, comprising a sketch of the problems and progress of German speculation, set forth with the author's well known acuteness and critical ability. At Jena taught Reinhold, Schiller, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Oken, and Fries. Reinhold first gave a popular exposition of the Kantian philosophy; Fichte developed it still further; Hegel and Schelling carried out idealism to its ulterior consequences. In opposition to the latter, Fries gave to the Critical Philosophy an anthropological character, and so he represented the second Kantian school. Herbart opposed the whole idealistic scheme. Schopenhauer made the fundamental fact and source of philosophy to be not reason, but the will. These points are developed in a concise manner in this felicitous oration. As a specimen of his style, we translate an extract on Kant's system: "Space and time are here viewed as pure intuitions (of sense), without which no representation (or image of any given object) is possible. The categories, especially that of causality, are the pure conceptions of the understanding, without which there could be no judgment, no experience, no knowledge of nature. The ideas, particularly that of freedom, give the rational ends or objects, without which there could be no moral action. All these points are carefully distinguished. Perceptions are one thing, conceptions another, ideas yet another. Perceptions are only of the sense, conceptions are only logical, ideas are only practical. With the exactitude of geometrical measurement, the sense is distinguished from the understanding, and both sense and understanding from reason, as the capacity that has respect to practical, moral ends."

But this seems to split up the mind into a variety of unreconciled powers and operations, and gives different and disconnected sciences. Is there not, after all, *one* reason, and *one* system? To this the system of Schelling answers in the affirmative: "In the one reason, the different powers are *identical*. *Identity* becomes the emphatic word". The same unity is sought for by Reinhold, reducing sense and understanding to one common term—viz. the power of forming conceptions or representations. Fichte found the unity in the *ego*, or self-consciousness, and in this the principle of all philosophy. The absolute unity of nature and freedom, in the highest sense, however, was in the *philosophy of identity*, as developed in Schelling's *Philosophy of Nature*, and in Hegel's *Logic*.

But still the inquiry remains in what does this identity consist—what is the one principle at the basis of all phenomena. Reason, replies the Hegelian. Not so, reason is not primitive, it is secondary and derivative; there must be some absolute, spontaneous, active principle at the basis, and to be the source of all things; that principle can only be *the will*; this is the position of Schopenhauer. He accepts identity, but puts it in the will.

On the other hand, Herbart is an opponent of identity in all its forms. He says the first duty of the philosopher is to examine the general conceptions of the mind, each by itself, to free them from contradictions, to make them harmonize with the logical laws; in other words, to make them conceivable. The doing this, gives us the system of metaphysics, as the fundamental branch of philosophy.

One other position is conceivable. It makes the following assertions. The fundamental science is not metaphysics—this is against Herbart and the identity-system, equally. This science must consist in a criticism of the reason—here it follows Kant. But this criticism is not to be metaphysical—it is not a matter of the reason. It cannot give us any system of identity as its result. This criticism must consist in a knowledge of the human mind and its capacities. This knowledge can only be derived from self-inspection—from anthropology, from empirical psychology. Hence the criticism of the reason must consist in a knowledge of the soul. "Its contents must be anthropological: its knowledge empirical." This is the standpoint of Fries. This is the essence of his *New Criticism of the Reason*.

Fries agrees with Locke and Hume in making the understanding at first empty. He agrees with Leibnitz in finding in reason primitive, obscure, undeveloped ideas, which are made clear by the reflection of the understanding. He agrees with Reid and Stewart in saying that this is a kind of common sense. By this common sense, he says, we are assured of the existence of the absolute, the perfect, the world of ideas. But this is in the form of feeling or faith. Here he is allied with Jacobi; and in this, De Wette, among the theologians, agrees with him.

The History of the Intellectual Development of Europe. By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M.D., LL.D. New York: Harpers. 1863. pp. 631. Dr. Draper, in this comprehensive attempt, proposes to do, what no one has done before—to "arrange the evidence offered by the intellectual history of Europe in accordance with physiological principles, so as to illustrate the orderly progress of civilization". We do not fully understand this. If it means only, that intellectual development is controlled by law; that nations in this development pass through various stages, of youth, maturity and decline; this is doubtless true. If, however, it means, that the laws of physiology are also the laws of moral, intellectual and spiritual growth, this, we think, is plainly an inadequate view. It would make physiology to be the science of the sciences. Running through the book, too, there is the silent assumption that progress in the natural or positive sciences is the real progress of the race—akin to the speculations of Comte and Buckle. Yet the author is more deferential than either of these writers to the power and need of the Christian system as an element of modern civilization, and necessary to its growth. He is, however, no believer in metaphysics, in the received sense; and he even declares "that the advancement of metaphysics is through the study of physiology". What sort of a metaphysics would that give us? Does physiology teach universal and necessary truths? Apart from this defect in the general idea of the work, it is undoubtedly a laborious compilation, and combines in an interesting exposition most of the main facts in the progress of mankind, especially in the sphere of physical research. The history of Greece and Rome and of mediæval and modern Europe is passed in review, bringing up all the main theological and ecclesiastical controversies. In some of them, as for example, in the account of the Trinitarian disputes, the author has evidently not read the most thorough expositions. But his sympathies are in unison with what tends to the general progress of mankind in freedom and well-being. The style is clear and vigorous.

PRACTICAL RELIGION.

The Preacher's Manual; Lectures on Preaching, furnishing Rules and Examples for every Kind of Pulpit Address. By REV. S. T. STURTEVANT. New York: James O'Kane, 126 Nassau street. 1863. This new edition of a well known and useful homiletic work, is reprinted entire from the last London edition. It is a comprehensive work of its class, and gives ample directions about all that pertains to the preparation of pulpit discourses. It also furnishes examples illustrative of the various rules, and of the different kinds of sermons. These are among the most interesting parts of the work, being selected from a wide circle of pulpit orators. It will be found a valuable manual for those who use and require such helps.

Letters on the Ministry of the Gospel. By FRANCIS WAYLAND. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. These plain and forcible words are designed to recall the ministry to its simplicity, and teach it the true source of its power. They contain valuable and needed warnings. We think, however, that undue stress is laid on extemporaneous preaching. All ministers need to read the book.

Patriarchal Shadows of Christ and His Church: as exhibited in passages drawn from the History of Joseph and his brethren. By OCTAVIUS WINSLOW, D.D. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1863. 12mo, pp. 402. Dr. Winslow is certainly a very prolific writer, and his writings are uniformly good. A decided evangelical spirit, and a practical and experimental element pervades them all. The present volume consists of fifteen familiar expository discourses on the life of Joseph. The author considers Joseph as a remarkable type of Christ, and runs an interesting, and in some points we think a somewhat fanciful, parallel between them. With the one aim of the book we heartily sympathize, viz. "to present CHRIST as the central object of the picture, grouping around him, as the Saviour ever delights to be portrayed, the Church which he has redeemed by his precious blood, and taken into personal inseparable union by the Spirit. Great and frequent stress is laid upon the fact that the believer has to do with a LIVING CHRIST—a truth but faintly received by many of the Lord's people".

Speaking to the Heart; or Sermons for the People. By THOMAS GUTHRIE, D.D. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1863. 18mo, pp. These sermons are characterized by great simplicity and pungency, and they bring home the Gospel to the popular mind with clearness and impressiveness. They are in many respects model sermons. There would be far more "speaking to the heart" than now if such a style of preaching were more common. It is to be feared that no small part of the preaching of the times is not aimed at the "People", and is not adapted to them, but is rather directed to the select few whose superior culture or æsthetic tastes enable them to understand and appreciate what is above the popular mind.

SCIENCE.

The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man, with Remarks on Theories of the Origin of Species by Variations. By SIR CHARLES LYELL, F.R.S. Philadelphia: G. W. Childs. 1863. 8vo, pp. 518. All the recent investigations upon the antiquity of the race are brought together in this new work of an eminent geologist, and discussed in a dispassionate method. The author evidently withholds his final judgment. Apart from theory, the

array of facts is by no means so formidable as has often been represented. With the favorite theory of Sir Charles, that the agencies of nature have always acted uniformly and slowly, inferences might be made prejudicial to the received chronology of the race; but who can prove this theory? Of the *flint* weapons of Abbeville and various parts of England, it can hardly be said that the proof of their being fashioned by man is complete; and no human remains have yet been found in conjunction with them. That any pre-Adamite men have been really exhumed is certainly quite doubtful. Human bones might be brought into contact with those of extinct animals, without their having lived together on the earth. The Engis and Neanderthal skulls are isolated specimens, and no man can yet tell where they are to be classed. On the man of 100,000 years at Natchez, Sir Charles "suspends his judgment". The fossil man of Denise is hardly beyond suspicion. The bones interred in the grotto of Aurignac may have been piled up together by some unknown persons. The calculation that the bits of pottery from the Nile are 13,380 years old, rests upon the supposition that the deposits are always gradually made. From the Danish peat and shell-mounds, and from the lacustrine villages of Switzerland, it is plausibly inferred, that there were inhabitants of these countries before the present races occupied the ground; but the inferences as to their pre-Adamite antiquity are insecure. And then there comes the startling fact, that if these races lived so long in these regions, they have left us no monuments of their existence beyond the rudest utensils; for thousands of years, these are all that they produced. The author advocates to some extent the theory of Darwin as to natural selection: but contends that it favors the unity of the race, and strengthens the arguments of natural theology. We have no fear of the final results of these and similar scientific investigations. They will ultimately help theology and the right interpretation of the Bible. But yet we think that nowadays natural philosophers are more speculative and theoretical than theologians; from slight facts they make enormous inferences. The American edition of this work is brought out in excellent style, and well illustrated.

The Races of the Old World: A Manual of Ethnology. By CHARLES L. BRACE. New York: Scribner. 1863. pp. 540. Such a Manual as this has been long needed, digesting multifarious researches into clear and comprehensive results. The larger works on Ethnology are too prolix and minute for the beginner and the general reader: and most of the treatises are on special races. Here the whole of the Old World is classified ethnologically, with pertinent descriptions, beginning with the earliest historical records. In this respect we know of no manual of equal excellence, so well adapted to the wants of students. The division of races is made on the basis of language. The author is judicious and correct in his statement and colligation of the main facts, though in some instances he accedes to extreme theories. In respect to Egypt, while not adopting the long chronology of Bunsen, he is induced to accept the views of Lepsius, putting the date of Menes anterior to that of the creation in the generally received chronology. No attempt is made to harmonize these views with the Biblical statements. In the chapter on the Antiquity of man, the author fairly gives in his adhesion to the existence of the *fossil* or *pre-Adamitic* man—in existence, it may be, "hundreds of thousand of years before any of the received dates of creation". We think that he has yielded a too ready assent to the positions of Lyell's recent work. The evidence cannot be said to warrant any such extravagant conclusions. Mr. Brace defends the unity of the race; but in order to reconcile the

unity with the diversity he assumes an indefinitely long period for making the changes. This unity, then, is not a unity in the historic Adam; it is not the unity taught in the Scriptures, and on which the Biblical doctrines of sin and of redemption hinge. He also has a curious theory, in conclusion, that great changes in the race will still go on, until at last we shall have a race in which truth and holiness shall be propagated, as sin is now inherited. We doubt whether Scripture, reason or physiology can be brought to sanction such a fanciful view. The work is admirably got up.

Manual of Scientific Discovery for 1863. Edited by DAVID A. WELLS, M.D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1863. pp. 343. With a portrait of Ericsson. This Manual is prepared with great care, and presents a sufficiently full record of all discoveries in the different branches of science. It is an indispensable work for all who would keep pace with the progress of physical research.

Grape Culture, Wines and Wine-Making. With Notes upon Agriculture and Horticulture. By A. HARASZTHY, Commissioner to report on the improvement and culture of the vine in California. With numerous Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1842. 8vo, pp. 420. This is a very readable book, as the author, who is an Hungarian, writes in tolerable English, and gives his own personal impressions of travel, as well as full and valuable reports on the subjects of which it treats. In the Appendix, which makes a large part of the book, the author gives a translation of Johann Carl Weine-Rund and numerous extracts from various authors treating on the subject. The volume is richly embellished, and will doubtless find many interested readers.

Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature. By THOS. H. HUXLEY. New York: Appletons. 1863. pp. 184. With illustrations. Professor Huxley belongs to the school of naturalists which draws no line between animals and man. On some of the facts of anatomical structure he is in sharp controversy with Professor Owen. This volume is chiefly made up of three Lectures, on The Natural History of the Man-like Apes—full of curious particulars, well described: on the Relations of Man to the Lower Animals—to show that there are great differences between the animals that immediately succeed us in the scale, as between these and man. Even “the highest faculties of feeling and of intellect begin to germinate in lower forms of life” (p. 129). But what indications of conscience, and of a knowledge of eternal and necessary truth, can be found in apes? “All are co-ordinated terms of Nature’s great progression, from the formless to the formed—from the inorganic to the organic—from blind force to conscious intellect and will.” And yet he concedes that this progression has gaps which science has not yet bridged. And he does not tell us how “blind force” can produce “conscious intellect and will.” The last chapter on some Fossils Remains of Man is on the crania of Engis and Neanderthal. These, he concedes, prove nothing as to an intermediate species between the highest animals and man. The amount of the matter is, that as far as science goes, there is no evidence of a gradual transition from apes to men: it is a pure theory of naturalism.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Story of my Career. By HEINRICH STEFFENS. Translated by WM. L. GAGE. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1863. pp. 284. Steffens was an enthusiastic naturalist, a disciple of Schelling, and in the last part of his

life an earnest believer. He charmed all who knew him by the vivacity of his conversation and the warmth of his social affections. He wrote largely upon the natural sciences and the philosophy of religion. In the latter part of his life, he published the *Story of his Life (Was ich erlebte)* in ten volumes—diffuse, entertaining, full of reminiscences of his student years in Freiburg and Jena, and his career as Professor at Halle, Breslau and Berlin. Selections from these volumes are translated in this little work by Mr. Gage, and they make a most interesting volume. Göthe, Schiller, Schelling, Schleiermacher, Jacobi, Fichte, Schlegel, Novalis and Neander are portrayed as they appeared in the familiarity of personal intercourse and in their public relations. The translation is very well done; the English runs smoothly. All interested in German literature will welcome these reminiscences. The translator will soon bring out a volume of Ritter's *Geographical Studies*; and he has also in hand a translation of Hagenbach's valuable work on the history of theological and philosophical opinions in Germany in the eighteenth century.

Paris in America. By Dr. René Lefebvre, *Parisian*. [Ed. Laboulaye, Professor in the Collège de France.] Translated by MARY L. BOOTH. New York: Scribner. 1863. Of Laboulaye and his various writings, especially his defence of our country, we gave a full account in the January number of our REVIEW. This new work describes, in a vivacious and amusing style, the effect produced upon a full-blooded Parisian by living in this country and becoming acquainted with the practical working of our institutions. Our social, political and religious life puts him at first into a state of entire confusion; but he gradually works himself out into sympathy with the main ideas of our democratic government, our modes of administering justice, and our freedom in matters of religion and education. Though the descriptions are often satirical, yet they upon the whole redound to our advantage; for M. Laboulaye is "the most American of Frenchmen". The work has already had a marked success in France. It is well translated.

African Hunting from Natal to the Zambesi, including Lake Ngami, the Kalahari Desert, etc., from 1852 to 1860. By W. CHS. BALDWIN, F.R.G.S. With a map, and numerous illustrations by Wolf and Zwecker. New York: Harpers. 1863. pp. 397. An entertaining story of varied and wild adventures, somewhat clumsily narrated. The writer came in contact with various missionaries, Moffat, Livingstone, Helmore, and the colonists of pastor Harms; and he always speaks well of them. It is said, that when Darwin saw the mission stations in New Zealand, he exclaimed, "The lessons of the missionary are the enchanter's wand". No book of African adventure contains more startling descriptions or adventurous exploits.

Tales and Sketches. By HUGH MILLER. Edited, with a Preface, by MRS. MILLER. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. For sale by Blakeman & Mason, New York. 1863. 12mo, pp. 369. Whatever comes from the pen of Hugh Miller will command numerous readers. These "Tales and Sketches" were written at an early period of the author's career, "during the first years of his married life", "composed literally over the midnight lamp, after returning late in the evening from a long day's work over the ledger and the balance-sheet. Tired though he was, his mind could not stagnate—he must write". The Tales and Sketches are ten in number, all of them interesting and racy, some of them quite tragical; others embody evidently not a little of his own experience, while others still are vivid pictures drawn from real life around him. His "Recollections of Ferguson" are indeed "exquisitely painful", while his "Recollections of Burns" will be

read with no ordinary interest. The Preface by Mrs. Miller is a gem in its way. On the whole the book will not lessen our regard for the memory of this man of genius and science and moral worth rarely combined.

Woman and Her Saviour in Persia. By a Returned Missionary. With five Illustrations and a Map of the Nestorian Country. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. For sale by Carter & Brothers, New-York. 1863. 12mo. 303. This volume is a fitting counterpart to the memoir of the lamented Stoddard. In connection with Miss Fiske's fifteen years' service in the Nestorian Mission, in the Female Seminary at Oroomiah, we have a pretty full and authentic history of what has been done for woman in and by means of that Mission among that ancient sect; and the record will be read with devout gratitude to God, as well as admiration for the heroic and self-sacrificing men and women who devoted their lives to the blessed work. The illustrations, copied from sketches taken on the spot by a skilful artist, add much to the value of the book.

May Dreams. By HENRY L. ABBEY. New York: Abbey & Abbot. 1862. 12mo, pp. 143. There is something *taking* in the title of these Poems. How descriptive of life's early aspirations and experiences! May dreams are so bright, so joyful, who has not indulged them; who would spoil them? And yet we discover in these "May Dreams" a slight tinge of sadness, as if some great Sorrow had touched the young Poet's heart and inspired his lyre. There is some genuine poetry in this little volume. Unambitious, and chaste in thought and expression, and abounding in descriptions of natural scenery and the varied passions and experiences of life, it is really a very readable book. May these early Spring flowers be succeeded by the golden tints and mellow fruit of a ripe and golden Autumn!

Sylvie's Lovers. A Novel. By MRS. GASKELL. Harpers: New York. 1863. An excellent novel, full of incident, of an unexceptionable moral tone. The Northern dialect, after it is spelt out, adds new interest to the scenes and characters. In its plot it is the most complete of Mrs. Gaskell's works.

A First Friendship. A Tale. New-York: Harpers. 1863. This anonymous novel shows unmistakable marks of skill in arranging the plot, and vigor in portraying characters. The work will be a favorite with the lover of fiction.

The Fairy Book. By the author of "John Halifax", etc. Children can ask for nothing better than the most popular fairy stories. Selected and re-written by Miss Mulock. All modern stories are excluded.

Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature. New York: W. H. BROWNELL. January to July, 1863. This noble Magazine fully sustains its well-earned reputation. Each number is tastefully embellished, and contains a greater variety and amount of excellent reading than can be found in any similar magazine in the country. Our friend, Mr. Bidwell, exhibits an admirable tact and great enterprise in the conduct of it. We have the work from the beginning in our library, and we prize it highly. No minister, no intelligent man, ought to be without it. The amount of literature (and of the best kind which the Old World affords) contained in it would surprise one not acquainted with it. The *Index* to the first fifty volumes recently published will give one some idea of the extent, and richness, and variety of the mental treasure here embodied.

Theological Eclectic. Edited by Prof. GEORGE E. DAY. Cincinnati, May, 1863. Wm. Scott, Publisher. Prof. Day has long had in contemplation a work of this character. The object of it is to furnish selections

from the current Theological Literature of England, France, Germany, and Holland. It is to be issued in monthly numbers of 24 pp. each. The first number has already been issued. Prof. Day is abundantly qualified to conduct such a work, and we have no doubt he will make it a valuable one. Its low price will bring it within the reach of all. We wish it all success. Whether it can be sustained, located at Cincinnati, and in this small and cheap form, remains to be seen.

POLITICAL WRITINGS.

Mr. Randolph, 683 Broadway, is doing good service by publishing excellent pamphlets on the war. Among these are C. J. Stelle's, *How a Free People Conduct a Long War*, and *Northern Interests and Southern Independence*—both able; *English Neutrality: Is the Alabama a British Pirate?* arguing the affirmative with strong reasons; Report by L. H. Steiner on the *Sanitary Commission*; *The Army of the Potomac*, by the Prince de Joinville, one of the most valuable criticisms of the campaign of 1862; *The Future of the Colored Race in America*, from the *Presbyterian Quarterly*, an instructive article; *The American War*, by Newman Hall, LL.D.—a hearty word of sympathy from England; *Christian Patriotism*, by William Adams, D.D., a felicitous and patriotic discourse; *Lessons of Encouragement from the Times of Washington*, by George L. Prentiss, D.D.—an eloquent encouragement to present duty, derived from the lessons of the past; *The Duty of the Hour*, by S. T. Spear, D.D., in his usual vigorous and loyal style; a *Letter to Judge Curtis* by C. P. Kirkland, reviewing with ability the pamphlet of the former in opposition to the President's Emancipation Proclamation; *A Geographical and Statistical View of the American Slaveholders' Rebellion*, by Sydney E. Morse, A.M., illustrated with a map, to counsel the taking possession of Eastern Tennessee and the adjacent region as the surest means of ending the war.

Other pamphlets bearing on the same subject are *Historical Notes on the Employment of Negroes in the American Army of the Revolution*, by George H. Moore; *Government and Rebellion*, an able Sermon by Rev. E. E. Adams of Philadelphia; *Negro Slavery Unjustifiable*, the 11th edition of Dr. Alex. McLeod's well known sermon preached in 1802; *Why the North cannot accept of Separation*, translated from Laboulaye; *A Letter from an Elder of an Old School Presbyterian Church to his Son in College*, of which it is enough to say that the anonymous author maintains that those who defend anti-slavery sentiments are guilty of the sin of blasphemy!

Mr. Randolph also has just published *National Currency: a Review of the National Banking Law*, by ELEAZAR LORD, an able and valuable Essay from one who is master of the subject.

The Results of Emancipation; The Results of Slavery. By AUGUSTIN COCHIN. Translated by MARY L. BOOTH. 2 vols. Walker, Wise & Co. Boston, 1863. Miss Booth is doing excellent service by her well-executed translations of French works, bearing on our present conflicts. M. Cochin, Ex-Maire and Municipal Councillor of Paris, received a prize from the French Institute for the above admirable volumes. The author is a Catholic, of the liberal French school. He is an earnest lover and advocate of liberty; he loves liberty, because he is a Christian. His works cover the ground of both emancipation and servitude. One volume narrates the progress and triumph of emancipation in modern history: 800,000 by England, 250,000 by France, and several thousand by Denmark and Sweden. At the time when he wrote, the abolition of slavery by Hol-

land, and of serfdom by Russia, was not yet completed. The other volume gives a darker and sadder picture—that of slavery as it still exists—some 7,000,000 slaves in nominally Christian countries. The larger part of this volume is devoted to our own country, and it is a truthful, candid, lucid and eloquent presentation of the history of slavery in this land, including the first year of the civil war, which this fearful system has drawn upon us. The sympathies of M. Cochin, as of so many other noble Frenchmen, are entirely with our National Government in this intense struggle. We owe the author a debt of gratitude for his espousal of our cause. His work is equally important for the moralist, the statesman and the Christian philanthropist. It is most important for the slaveholders themselves. It will be referred to as an authority in the discussions on emancipation already begun in the Border States. It is written in a philosophical spirit, and with true French conciseness and vivacity. The American Bibliography of slavery might easily be enlarged. We give these volumes a most cordial recommendation, and predict for them a wide circulation and a useful career. It is one of the best and most conclusive arguments, based on facts, that has yet been made in favor of the practicability and safety of emancipation and against the evils of the unnatural system of human bondage. It is handsomely brought out by the Boston publishers.

1

ART. XI.—ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

By EDWIN F. HATFIELD, D.D., New York.

LICENSED TO PREACH.

Mr. Llewellyn Pratt,	December	, 1862, by the Presb. of Philadelphia, Third.				
" Edward Clarence Smith,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" William W. Wetmore,	January 28th, 1863,	"	"	"	Utica.	
" Charles F. Dowd,	February 20th,	"	"	"	Troy.	
" Charles T. Berry,	March 16th,	"	"	"	Newark.	
" S. Russell Johnson,	April 2d,	"	"	"	Alton.	
" William H. Clark,	" 7th,	"	"	"	New York, Fourth.	
" John H. McVey,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Abram J. Quick,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Leonard E. Richards,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Albert C. Bishop,	" 8th,	"	"	"	Third.	
" Frederick A. W. Brown,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" James B. Finch,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Ellsworth J. Hill,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Joel J. Hough,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Alexander Nesbitt,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Ezra D. Shaw,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" William White Williams,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Henry J. Crane,	" 14th,	"	"	"	Montrose.	
" George M. Boynton,	" 15th,	"	"	"	Brooklyn.	
" William H. Clark,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" John H. Meacham,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Alexander Lamberison,	May 8th,	"	"	"	Cayuga.	
" William Campbell,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Theodore D. Marsh,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Alexander M. Helser,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Philemon R. Day,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Isalah Reid,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" James S. Hanning,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Frederick A. Parmenter,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" George White,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Calvin P. Quick,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" John Killand,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Edward Dickinson,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Edwin A. Spence,	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Charles M. Livingston,	"	"	"	"	"	"

ORDINATIONS.

Mr. Alvin Baker	Sept. 3d, 1862, Evangelist,	by the Presb. of North River.
" Edward P. Roe,	" " " "	" " "
" James Robertson,	" 16th, "	" " Newark.
" George W. Mackie,	Oct. 1st, " Pastor, Adams, N. Y.	" " Watertown.

Mr. Charles D. Shaw,	Nov. 5th, 1862,	Pastor, Paterson, 2d,	by Presb. of Newark.
" James B. Fisher,	" 16th,	" Evangelist,	" " Rockaway.
" Joseph Little,	" 19th,	" "	" " Pataskala.
" Edward Payson Hammond,	Jan. 2d, 1863,	" "	" " New York, 3d.
" Corlis B. Gardner,	" 20th,	" "	" " Rochester.
" William A. Wolcott,	" 23th,	" "	" " Chemung.
" Ziba N. Bradbury,	" "	" "	" " Steuben.
" Edmund B. Miner,	Feb. 4th,	Pastor, Baraboo, Wis.,	" " Columbus.
" Samuel B. Sherrill,	" 7th,	" Cato, N. Y.	" " Cayuga.
" Jenkyn D. Jenkins,	" 17th,	" Evangelist,	" " Cleveland.
" Thomas Nichols,	Mar. 11th,	Pastor, Chester, N. Y.,	" " Hudson.
" Samuel J. Mills,	" 15th,	" Evangelist,	" " Iowa City.
" Charles T. Berry,	" 17th,	" "	" " Newark.
" John P. Roe,	Apr. 8th,	" "	" " North River.
" John E. Werth,	" 16th,	" "	" " Cayuga.
" Malcolm McG. Dana,	" 19th,	" "	" " Brooklyn.
" George M. Tife,	May 11th,	Pastor, Nichols, N. Y.,	" " Tioga.
" James B. Finch,	June 6th,	" Evangelist,	" " New York, 3d.

INSTALLATIONS.

Rev. Joseph M. McNulty,	Aug. 13th, 1862,	Montgomery, N. Y.,	by Presb. of Hudson.
" William R. S. Betts,	Dec. 23d,	" Otisville, N. Y.,	" " "
" Rollin A. Sawyer,	Jan. 1st, 1863,	Newark, 2d, O.,	" " Pataskala.
" Herrick Johnson,	" 10th,	" Pittsburgh, 3d, Pa.,	" " Pittsburgh.
" Samuel W. Crittenden,	" 18th,	" Darby, 1st, Pa.,	" " Philadelphia, 3d.
" Charles H. Holloway,	Feb. 17th,	" Shelter Island, N. Y.,	" " Long Island.
" Tertius S. Clarke, D.D.,	Mar. 7th,	" Weedsport, N. Y.,	" " Cayuga.
" James M. Dickson,	" 11th,	" Newark, 6th, N. J.,	" " Newark.
" Jacob A. Prime,	" 23d,	" Troy, Liberty St., N. Y.,	" " Troy.
" Howard Crosby, D.D.,	" 25th,	" New York, 4th Av., N. Y.,	" " New York, 4th.
" Henry B. Holmes,	" "	" Dubuque, 2d, Io.,	" " Dubuque.
" Wilbur McKaig,	May 3d,	" Cincinnati, 3d, O.,	" " Cincinnati.
" Joel Parker, D.D.,	" 6th,	" Newark, Park, N. J.,	" " Newark.
" Herman C. Riggs,	" "	" Potsdam, N. Y.,	" " St. Lawrence.

DISSOLUTIONS OF THE PASTORAL RELATION.

Rev. Elzsur N. Manley,	Dec. 1862,	Oakfield, N. Y.,	by Presb. of Genesee.
" John R. Young,	Jan. 13th, 1863,	Plattsburgh, "	" " Champlain.
" William T. Doubleday,	" "	" Delhi, "	" " Delaware.
" David F. Judson,	" 28th,	" Addison, "	" " Chemung.
" John E. Baker,	Feb. 9th,	" Arkport, N. Y.	" " Genesee Valley.
" Joel Parker, D.D.,	" 11th,	" New York, 4th Av., N. Y.,	" " New York, 4th.
" Charles C. Carr,	Mar. 28th,	" Burdett, N. Y.,	" " Chemung.
" William Grassie,	April 14th,	" Wattsburgh, Pa.,	" " Erie.
" George L. Little,	" 15th,	" Waukegan, Ill.,	" " Chicago.
" William A. McCorkle,	" 16th,	" Marshall, Mich.,	" " Marshall.
" William C. Clark,	" 22d,	" Warren, O.,	" " Trumbull.
" Alexander Trotter,	" 29th,	" Livingstonville, N. Y.,	" " Catskill.
" Samuel Loomis,	" "	" Rensselaerville, "	" " "
" Charles A. Smith, D.D.,	" "	" Philadelphia, Western, Pa.,	" " Philadelphia, 3d.
" Walter S. Drysdale,	" "	" E. Whiteland, Pa.,	" " "
" James Donaldson,	" "	" Pleasant Val., Westm., N. Y.,	" " North River.
" John Crowell,	May,	" Orange, 2d, N. J.,	" " Newark.
" Lyman Gilbert, D.D.,	" 17th,	" Malden, N. Y.,	" " Catskill.
" Homer McVay,	" "	" Delhi, O.,	" " Franklin.
" William N. McHarg,	" "	" Lyons, N. Y.,	" " Lyons.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE.

Rev. John E. Baker,	from Arkport, N. Y.,	to Cuba, N. Y.
" William T. Bartle,	" Decatur, Mich.,	" Vassar, Mich.
" Oliver B. Bidwell,	" Boston, Mass.,	" New York City.
" Elijah Bonney,	" Vernon Centre, N. Y.,	" Hadley, Mass.
Mr. Ziba N. Bradbury,	" New York City, N. Y.,	" Howard, N. Y.
Rev. P. G. Buchanan,	" Oakland, Cal.,	" Watsonville, Cal.
" Charles P. Bush,	" New York City, N. Y.	" Rochester, N. Y.
" Samuel W. Bush,	" Binghamton, "	" Galesburgh, Ill.
" Thomas H. Canfield,	" Kossuth, Io.,	" Lucas Grove, Wis.
" Darwin Chichester,	" Wolcott, N. Y.,	" Burdett, N. Y.
" Calvin Clark,	" Chicago, Ill.,	" Detroit, Ill.
" Lemuel Clark,	" Westford, N. Y.,	" Lawrence, Ill.
" William W. Collins,	" Starkey, N. Y.,	" Maine, N. Y.
Mr. Archibald Crawford,	" Smyrna, N. Y.,	" Paris, N. Y.
Rev. Charles D. Curtiss,	" Hocking Port, O.,	" Belpre, O.
" George F. Davis,	" Mt. Sterling, Ill.,	" Newtown, Ill.
" Friend A. Deming,	" Sand Ford, Ind.,	" Mattoon, Ill.
" James M. Dickson,	" Brooklyn, N. Y.,	" Newark, N. J.
" John H. Dillingham,	" Manitowoc, Wis.,	" Berlin, Wis.
" Samuel J. Dorsey,	" Ripley, N. Y.,	" Millport, N. Y.
" William T. Doubleday,	" Delhi, N. Y.,	" Binghamton, Wis.
" John V. Downs,	" Ridgefield, Ill.,	" Thornton Station, Ill.
" Latten W. Dunlap,	" Mt. Sterling, Ill.,	" Perry, Ill.
" David R. Eddy,	" Wenona, Ill.,	" Belvidere, Ill.
" John H. Edwards,	" Rockport, Ill.,	" New Lebanon, N. H.
" Ambrose Eggleston,	" Binghamton, N. Y.,	" Coldwater, Mich.
" John Fairchild,	" Wabash, Ind.,	" Menekaunee, Wis.
" John B. Fish,	" Cairo, N. Y.,	" Catskill, N. Y.
Mr. Edward P. Gardner,	" Buffalo, N. Y.,	" Cherry Valley, N. Y.
Rev. Lorenzo M. Gates,	" Hilldale, N. Y.,	" Louisville, Wis.
" John Gerlach,	" New Washington, Ind.,	" Lapeer, Mich.
" Daniel Gibbs,	" Oneida, N. Y.,	" Pletcher, N. Y.
" James Gordon,	" Albion, Io.,	" Point Pleasant, Io.
" William Grassie,	" Wattsburgh, Pa.,	" Edinboro', Pa.
" Chester Holcomb,	" Joy, N. Y.,	" Fairville, N. Y.
" Henry B. Holmes,	" Belvidere, Ill.,	" Dubuque, Io.
" Homer P. Hovey,	" New Haven, Ct.,	" Florence, Mass.
" Joel Jewell,	" Wells, N. Y.,	" West Newark, N. Y.
" David F. Judson,	" Addison, N. Y.,	" Praftsburgh, N. Y.
" William M. Kain,	" Unionville, Io.	" Marengo, Io.
" John W. Lane,	" Bethany, N. Y.,	" East Pembroke, N. Y.
" Samuel Lee,	" Hudson, O.,	" Mantua Centre, O.
" Alvah Lilly,	" Gorham, N. Y.,	" Pewaukee, Wis.
" James A. Little,	" Canastota, N. Y.,	" New York City, N. Y.
" Samuel Loomis,	" Rensselaerville, N. Y.,	" Vineland, N. J.
" Lewis H. Loss,	" Kendall, Ill.,	" Marshalltown, Io.
" Hugh McBride,	" Monticello, Ind.,	" Reynoldsburgh, O.
" William A. McCorkle,	" Marshall, Mich.,	" Detroit, Mich.
" William H. McGifford,	" Boonville, N. Y.,	" North Adams, Mass.
" Homer McVay,	" Radnor, O.,	" Reynoldsburgh, O.
" Elbur N. Manley,	" Oakfield, N. Y.,	" Boonville, N. Y.
" Augustus Marsh,	" Brooklyn, Mich.,	" Grand Rapids, Mich.
Mr. John Monteith, Jr.,	" Jackson, O.,	" Cleveland, O.
Rev. Edward D. Neill,	" Saint Paul, Mich.,	" Philadelphia, Pa.
" Oliver W. Norton,	" Springfield Cross Roads, Pa.,	" Brooklyn, Mich.
" J. Odell,	" Albion, Mich.,	" East Hamburg, Pa.
" Sjoerd Ossinga,	" Thornton, Ill.,	" Gun Plain, Mich.

American Presbyterian and Theological Review.

NUMBER IV.

CONTENTS OF THE OCTOBER NUMBER, 1863.

ART. I. PRESBYTERIANISM: ITS AFFINITIES,	529
By Rev. ALBERT BARNES, Philadelphia.	
II. THE SOURCES OF CRIME,	558
By E. C. WINES, D.D., LL.D., New-York.	
III. FALSE TENDENCY AND RADICAL DEFECT IN EDUCATION,	587
By Rev. J. R. HERRICK, Malone, N. Y.	
IV. AMERICAN NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARIES,	602
By HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., New York.	
V. MARK II, 23, AS COMPARED WITH MATTHEW XII, 1, AND LUKE VI, 1,	609
By Rev. C. C. STARBUCK, Union Theological Seminary, New York.	
VI. DRAPER'S INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPE,	615
By Prof. HENRY B. SMITH, D.D., New York.	
VII. THE CHINESE CLASSICS,	631
By Prof. ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK, D.D., New York.	
VIII. ROGER BACON IN THE LIGHT OF NEW DOCUMENTS,	639
By EMILE SAISSSET, Prof. in the Faculty of Letters, Paris. Translated from the <i>Revue des Deux Mondes</i> , by Col. JOSEPH HOWLAND, Matteawan, N. Y.	
IX. THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.	
France,	673
Italy,	676
Switzerland,	677
Scandinavia,	677
Belgium,	677
Spain,	678
Germany,	678
England,	682
United States of America,	686
X. CRITICISMS ON BOOKS.	
THEOLOGY AND RELIGION: Mediæval Tracts—Wycliffe on the Pastoral Office—Farrar's Critical History of Free Thought—Prof. Mahan's Palmoni—Bishop M'Ilvaine's Work of Preaching Christ—Dr. Stanley's Sermons,	
688	
HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY: Alcock's Capital of the Tycoon—Mémorial of Hon. Theo. Frelinghuysen—Schieffelin's Foundations of History—A Sergeant's Memorial—Capt. Noyes' Bivouac and Battle-Field,	
691	
MORAL AND POLITICAL QUESTIONS: Kay's Social Condition and Education of the People in England—Mrs. Kemble's Life on a Georgian Plantation,	
693	
EDUCATION: Hooker's Science for the School and Family—Loomis' Arithmetic—Wilson's Speller—Youman's Chemistry,	
694	
GENERAL LITERATURE: Prof. Clark's Elements of the English Language—Pearls of Thought—Peter Carradine—Romola—Live it Down—The Young Parson,	
694	